DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 300	AA 000 696

AUTHOR	Adams, Raymond S.; And Others
TITLE	Linguistics and the Training of Teachers of the Disadvantaged: A Final Report - Part I.
INSTITUTION	Missouri Univ., Columbia. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Educational Personnel Development.
PUB DATE	69
GRANT	OEG-0-9-354719-1712-725
NOTE	265p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS	*Disadvantaged Groups, *Educational Programs, *Linguistics, *Teacher Education, *Trainees
IDENTIFIERS	Training Teacher Trainers Project, University of Missouri

ABSTRACT

The potential relevance of linguistics in the development of a teacher training program is investigated. The investigation is comprised of: (1) the deliberations of the Linguistics consortium; (2) a condensed version of the material abstracted in a literature search; (3) a conceptual mapping of the field, with listings of relevant facts; and (4) a summation. The consortium focuses on, "What linguistic knowledge and insight the teachers of underprivileged children should know, think, feel and understand." The abstracts appear in the following format: author, bibliographical data, a descriptive statement of the item's nature, data-supported points or points known to be data supportable, data-free assertions, authors' recommendations, and comments when applicable. Information derived from the abstracts is presented under the following categories: Sub-cultural Patterns, Dialects and Usage, Non-standard Negro English, Indians, Spanish-Americans, Intellectual Development and Performance, Bilingualism, Language and Language Arts, Reading, Linguistic Methods, Project Head Start, and Pre-school Language Projects. It is concluded that teachers should be trained in an "acceptant" approach to language in teaching. For related documents, see ED 050 301-306. (CK)

ED 050 300

LINGUISTICS AND THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS OF THE DISADVANTAGED

A FINAL REPORT

PART I

Contract
No. OEG-0-9-354719-1712-725
Office of Education
Department of Health, Education and Welfare

BY

RAYMOND S. ADAMS
NICHOLAS J. SOBIN AND GLORIA LOCKERMAN

College of Education
University of Missouri
Columbia
1969

AA 000 696

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Section I: The Consortium 2

Section II: Literature search abstracts (alphabetically by author) 105

Section III: Abstracted information: 217
- Sub-cultural pattern 219
- Dialect and usage 219
- Non-Standard Negro English 221
- Indians 223
- Spanish-Americans 223
- Intellectual Development and performance 225
- Bilingualism 226
- Language and Language Arts 227
- Reading 228
- Linguistic methods 230
- Project Head Start 230
- Pre-School Language projects 231

Section IV: Summation: 235
- The Trainee as a Language User 235
- The Trainee as an Attitude Recepticle 239
- The Trainee as a Social Analyst 242
- The Trainee as a Language analyst 243
- The Trainee as a Teacher of Language 244
- Conclusion 254

PREFACE

This is the first of a series of reports concerned with the teaching of disadvantaged children. They are the direct outcome of the proposal funded as part of the U.S. Office of Education's T.T.T. Project. The initial proposal was presented under the names of Samuel R. Keys, Raymond S. Adams and William D. Hedges as co-project directors and Bob G. Woods as Dean of the College of Education. Prior to the writing of the proposal, a planning committee after deliberating over general priorities agreed on the focus that should be adopted in the present undertaking. The committee comprised: Robert Wheeler, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Kansas City, Mo., William D. Hedges, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Clayton, Mo., and from the University of Missouri at Columbia, Samuel R. Keys, Associate Dean of the College of Education, Francis English, Dean of Arts and Science, Donald O. Cowgill, Professor of Sociology, Ralf C. Bedell, Professor of Education and Raymond S. Adams, Associate Professor of Social Research, Education and Sociology.

This present report confines its attention to the potential relevance of linguistics in the development of a teacher training program. It represents only one section of the initial phase of what was planned, as a multi-phase project. In order to set the present report in perspective it is useful to outline the rationale that lies behind the whole scheme.

We started initially depressed and impressed by the facts that for the disadvantaged child, the consequences of disadvantage are a deprived and unhappy past, a drab and unpromising present and a future beset with hopelessness. We recognized that if education were to combat the deprivations of disadvantage, it would have to undergo substantial reform and improvement. However, whatever the nature of this reform and improvement might be, it would be of no use if the teachers of disadvantaged children remained incompetent to deal with their unique educational problem. For this reason, we felt that the most immediate task was to go about training teachers who could operate successfully with disadvantaged children--irrespective of the extent to which school systems had undergone organisational and economic reform themselves.

We were led by our emphasis on teaching to focus initially on the teacher-pupil transactions. In the most down-to-earth terms, the educational process requires the teacher to act as an intermediary between the child and the subject matter of the curriculum. As an intermediary, the teacher translates subject matter into forms appropriate for the level of conceptual development of the child. How efficient the teacher is then, depends on (a) her subject matter competency, (b) her ability to understand the child's conceptual state, and (c) her ability to mediate between the two. It has been clearly demonstrated (Coleman, 1968) that teachers have failed spectacularly as mediators for the disadvantaged child. Available evidence suggests that this failure stems not from ignorance of subject matter but rather from a lack of understanding of how the disadvantaged child thinks, how he feels and how he 'sees' the world around him.

While the 'problem' may be stated in relatively simple terms, solutions cannot be. What we have here, is an 'understanding-gap' that separates the teacher from the taught--the ghetto dweller from the mainstream of American life. And this is a culture gap--sometimes as wide if not wider than the gap between American culture and say Japanese. The illustration may be overly dramatic, but the ingredients are the same. The two cultures, ghetto and non-ghetto, are grossly ignorant of each others ways of life. Egocentrically and ethnocentrically, they perceive their own virtues and the other's vices. Seldom do they see their own vices and the other's virtues. Because the two cultures have long been separated, their respective inhabitants have seldom felt constrained to examine their intercultural relationships. Now with protest and discontent burgeoning, and intercultural 'incidents' increasing, we have become aware of the need to pay attention to the social problem in our midst. What we see does not enchant. We have, in the case of the disadvantaged it seems, tangible evidence that violates the American dream.

But merely to identify the problem and become intensely concerned, is not to solve it. Solution depends on overcoming the inertia of history--the social conditions that led to the extremes of poverty and disadvantage. They are, though we may be unwilling to admit it, still with us to a considerable degree. We have eliminated the practices of slavery but the attitudes that made it socially acceptable in the first place, have only undergone slight evolutions. Attitudes towards ethnic minorities and the economically unsuccessful, still reflect older beliefs in the social moral and intellectual inadequacy of those who can be so classified. Given the irrationality of such attitudes and beliefs, and given their disfunctional social consequences, reform is patently necessary. But the task is obviously a mammoth one. It will not be accomplished by haphazard, piece-meal attacks on selected problems here and there. Nor will it be accomplished immediately. We can anticipate that over the years efforts at amelioration will intensify, in range, in scope and in focus. One focus, and we think a critically important one, will be education. However, education has not yet served the disadvantaged community well. It too is bowed down by its own inertia. Consequently if education is to change, it too will have to do more than make minor modifications to its venerable structure.

Because we believed that educational change in the training of teachers of disadvantaged children would need to be substantial, we envisaged (i) the development of a comprehensive and integrated 'system' (in the systems theory sense of the word) for training teachers of the underprivileged so that they become experts in understanding the world of the disadvantaged; (ii) the implementation of that system as both pre-service and in-service teacher training programs, and most importantly, (iii) the utilization of this system in-action as a training program for the trainers of teachers of the disadvantaged.

However, another assumption underlay our initial planning. We did not necessarily believe that all change must necessarily be for the better. We were convinced that some needless expenditure of money and effort could be avoided by careful and systematic planning. We also believed that careful and systematic planning would be facilitated if advantage were taken of whatever up-to-date knowledge relevant to the problem could be gathered, evaluated and used. Because we thought that a substantial amount of the knowledge available in the social sciences about the world of the disadvantaged child would be relevant, we argued that it should therefore be accumulated, distilled and, when approved, be incorporated into our new system for training teachers.

While in accordance with the Triple T requirements, our principal objective was to provide a training program that would be viable for preparing trainers of teachers of the underprivileged. We held that such viability cannot be demonstrated unless competent teachers are being produced. Thus, hand in hand with the main objective then went a correlative one of developing a program for the actual training of teachers. This program for teachers of underprivileged children then would serve two purposes: (1) to provide concrete evidence of the practical results of the system, (2) to provide a continuing source of evaluation of and feedback to the main programs.

It should be emphasized at the outset that the training of teachers involves more than the trainers themselves. It involves curricula, equipment, plant, and, in fact, all the paraphernalia of the entire teaching program. Consequently, any improvement in any of these is, in effect, an improvement of the trainer. The project provided not only for improvement in the training of the trainers, but also improvement in teaching aids and curricula as well. Further, it provided for improvement in the quality of supplementary training given by school administrators and supervisory teachers. Finally, in order to follow through, it provided for the development of a completely new teacher-training program per se.

The program can best be seen as a series of interrelated Tasks. These Tasks cluster to form four major Operations. These Operations are respectively: (1) research and development; (2) activation; (3) dissemination; and (4) application. Operation 1 represents the 'planning stage', Operation 2 represents the 'pilot stage', and Operations 3 and 4 represent the 'operating stage'. The present report is concerned only with one aspect of Operation 1. As such it is consistent with the other aspects of Operation 1. They all employ the same strategy. It is different from the others in that its focus is on linguistics.

Rationale. Educational action should be based on scientifically gleaned information. Regrettably, there is no empirical evidence available that adequately specified the consequences of any program for the disadvantaged. Educators cannot say with assurance 'if you do so and so with disadvantaged children, then such and such will result'. The best available information at the moment consists of teachers' 'good ideas', the assembled 'folk wisdom' of the past. Regrettably the worst available information also comes from the same source. This folk wisdom as we have seen, has been grossly inadequate in meeting the needs of the disadvantaged child--partly because there is no a priori basis for distinguishing between the best and the worst, and partly because no attempts have been made to accumulate, integrate and organize the insights and understandings that expert practitioners have. However, other social sciences have been concerned with the underprivileged for some time. They have evidence and insights that could be valuable if adapted to educational purposes. Given the criticism of current educational practice, it seems wise at this point in time, to take advantage of any scientifically derived evidence no matter its origin, provided that in the judgement of educationists, it is seen as potentially useful.

The problem that initally confronted us was to select among the different social science areas available. The relevancy of psychology and sociology were, we thought, both self evident. So was that area of educational research devoted specifically to the disadvantaged. We also felt that Social Work, with its direct contact with inner city life-styles would also prove fruitful. We deliberated somewhat longer before agreeing to include the fields of Community Development and Linguistics. We justified both selections for different reasons. The development of communities--new communities--was one basic assumption upon which our whole reformative approach was based. We assumed that new communities would (eventually) be developed both within the 'education system' and within society at large. If our new teachers were to be part of the process then they would be better prepared to deal with it, we reasoned, were they familiar with what Community Development had to offer.

The decision to focus on Linguistics was arrived at because of the central part language plays in education. Many of the reformative programs being attempted in schools are already attempting to improve language performance on the assumption that this would facilitate other educational performances. We were also aware of the controversy over the nature and extent of differences between black American English and white (standard) American English. Thus we reasoned that if language is critically central to a child's education and if language styles and habits are culturally determined, then Linguistics should be relevant to our problem.

To the resulting six social science areas we added a seventh that could not be strictly classified as scientific. We felt that practical experience should not be completely disregarded. We knew that teachers had insights and understandings that were invaluable. The fact that they were not necessarily well documented in the literature or well integrated in the way that an academic theoretician might systematise his understandings, was not a sufficient deterrent to prevent our attempting to probe this area too.

Our intention then was to attempt to establish a bridge between education and each of these areas. To mix the metaphor we wished to begin a process of translation into educationally useful terms of what might otherwise be regarded as exotic and esoteric information exclusively the property of the social sciences.

Our strategy in approaching each of the areas was the same in each case. It was twofold. First, we were to assemble a group of five acknowledged leaders in the field and confront them with the question: 'Given what insights you have into your area and knowledge you have about it, what do you consider the teacher of disadvantaged children needs to know, think, feel and understand'. In the discussion that ensued, the task of the moderator (an educationist) was to confine attention to this single-minded question and to probe the implications of the point raised. Initial experimentation led us to conclude that an all day session (with suitable breaks) provided optimal returns. The discussion was tape-recorded and the resulting transcript then provided a permanent record of currently salient ideas. The second strategy entailed an extensive search of contemporary literature. This was to be undertaken by graduate students in the specific areas. Because they knew available sources, and because their conceptual orientation would be a function of their recent training, they would, we thought, provide the best media. They were initially instructed in the objectives of the exercise and the frames of reference they were to use. They too had to adopt a similar single-minded focus--the relevancy of the writings they were examining for the teacher who was teaching disadvantaged children. They were charged: to (i) survey all contemporary writing that dealt with the disadvantaged condition, (ii) abstract from each example whatever was thought to be (even remotely) relevant to the central issue, (iii) organize the abstracts so that listed after the bibliographical data, were (a) a statement of facts that were empirically supported (or were known to be empirically supportable), (b) a statement of assertions not empirically supported, (c) any relevant recommendations made within the article and (d) where thought necessary, any comments. The abstracted material was then recorded onto McBee cards. Subsequently, the complete array of McBee cards was studies in order that a basis for conceptually mapping the whole area could be developed. Thereupon, the McBee cards were again examined, this time to relate their content to the respective conceptual categories. This completed, we would then have a systematically ordered and organized set of information on which the next stage of the planning process could build. The next stage was to involve the construction of a set of behavioral objectives consonant with the distilled information, and appropriate for teachers of disadvantaged children.

This present report presents the outcomes of the examination of the Linguistics area. Specifically it records (i) the deliberations of the Linguistics consortium, (ii) a condensed version of the material abstracted in the literature search, (iii) a conceptual mapping of the field accompanied by brief listings of relevant facts, (iv) a final summation. The report has been organized on two assumptions. First that the gathering together of Linguistics information relevant to the education of the disadvantaged would prove useful to those concerned with developing teacher training programs. In this sense, the report is a source book. Second, that the outcomes of our own deliberations on the problems of educating disadvantaged children might also prove helpful to others who have similar concerns. However, because we recognize that the planners of training programs are as uniquely individualistic as the problems they confront, our emphasis is on the first rather than the second.

Most readers, we assume, will make use of the first three sections. We of course, will make most use of the fourth. It will provide the pad from which the next step of practical implementation will be launched.

As well as the co-directors a number of people involved in this part of the project should receive special mention. Initially, fiscal responsibility for the project rested with Dean Keys. When he accepted appointment at Kansas State University the task was taken up by B. Charles Leonard. Gloria Lockerman and Nicholas Sobin took major responsibility for the literature search and Fred Gies and Barney Madden performed substantive and administrational roles. Terence Halliday also helped in the preparation of the manuscript.

SECTION I

This section is devoted entirely to the consortium held in Kansas City in April 1968. Its participants were:

Professor Harold B. Allen,
Department of English,
University of Minnesota.

Professor Rudolf C. Troike,
Department of English,
University of Texas.

Professor Marvin D. Loflin,
Department of Anthropology, and
Center for Research in Social Behavior,
University of Missouri at Columbia.

Dr. Roger Shuy,
Center of Applied Linguistics,
Washington D.C.

Professor Robert Stockwell,
Chairman of Linguistics,
University of California at L.A.

and, as moderator,

Professor Raymond S. Adams,
College of Education, and
Center for Research in Social Behavior,
University of Missouri at Columbia.

The detail of the consortium's discussion is contained in the bulk of the paragraphs that follow. Perhaps concealed by the editor's scissors however, may be the freedom, intensity and goodwill of the exchanges that occurred. Without equivocation and without pretence the five experts addressed themselves single-mindedly to our educational problem. In the process the exchanges were sometimes fierce, sometimes humorous, sometimes assured, sometimes humble. The impression given was that these five serious scholars were genuinely concerned over a social problem and were anxious to bring to bear whatever insights they had, in order to help. In the process, veridicality was claimed when justified by the evidence but uncertainty acknowledged when evidence was lacking. If the quality and sympathetic seriousness of the exchange is not communicated in the transcript, the blame is not the speakers'.

Several conventions have been used in editing the transcript. First the speakers have not been identified separately although the moderator has--so that his linguistic naivete will not be mistakingly attributed to the experts. Speakers are denoted with one asterisk, the moderator with two. Second, an attempt has been made to preserve the essential messages of the discussion faithfully. However, in order to go part-way towards meeting the expectations that readers might have about printed script, an attempt has been made to convert oral language forms to those thought appropriate for written language. This is in fact a violation of one of the essential points brought out in the discussion, namely that forms of language vary (substantially) from context to context. The editor apologises for displaying so much linguistic inflexibility.

At the beginning of the meeting a little time was spent establishing the parameters within which discussion should proceed. Two principal points were made. First, the essential focus was reiterated: our concern was with 'what linguistic knowledge and insight would suggest that teachers of underprivileged children should know, think, feel and understand'. Second, the Linguists wanted to make it clear that their concern was with functional language--the language of real life. This, of course, influenced the way in which they looked at education.

** As you know it is our intention to set anew program for training the trainers of teachers of disadvantaged children. As a first step however, we have to establish a system for training teachers that can itself be demonstrated as effective. In order to take this first step we need to plan our operation carefully taking advantage of the past successes and errors of education. We also believe that we should try to take advantage of whatever understandings of the problem of underprivilege reside in social science areas as well. We believe we should probe the Social Sciences for their knowledge of what might be germane for teachers of underprivileged youngsters.

In the process of selecting our 'social science areas' we were persuaded, partly because of the convictions of one of our committee members--a negro educator and administrator--that linguistics was an important area that had to be covered. We are also planning to tap sociology, social psychology, social work and community development. In each case we are following two procedures. First, we are having groups of acknowledged experts in the respective fields assembled to discuss, with single-minded concentration I hope, one particular focussing question. And secondly, we are having intensive bibliographical searches undertaken in each of the areas by graduate students.

For example, our linguist searchers will review linguistics literature, filtering it according to their own insights and understandings. Our focussing question to them is: "Is what you are looking at potentially relevant to a teacher of underprivileged youngsters?" When we have accumulated this information we plan to attempt to systematize it, in order to develop a conceptual framework that allows us to order and organize the ideas that are generated in the field. At that stage we will produce a report that outlines a linguistics perspective on educating the underprivileged (or a sociological perspective on educating the underprivileged, and so on). Phase I of our study will be completed when all the reports are assembled. After that the educationists will take over and scrutinize these insights. If they think the ideas are reasonable and viable, they will set about creating a curriculum that incorporates them--a curriculum for training teachers of the underprivileged. This will be done by converting these ideas into what educationists call behavioral objectives. Behavioral objectives in this case are statements of what the students should be able to do after they have been exposed to training. To implement these behavioral objectives, a number of curriculum back-ups will be needed--teaching aids of one sort or another, teaching devices, maybe programmed learning, maybe computer assisted instruction, etc. The final packaged program will then constitute an attempt to implement the ideas that have been generated by the respective social science areas. At that point a pilot program will be initiated for some forty trainees who are destined to teach in urban schools. They will be trained and the system will be evaluated and, if necessary, modified, so that it can subsequently be implemented as a full scale program for training teachers. At that point and only at that point, when we have got a viable program of demonstrated quality, will we be able to talk about training trainers to use the program.

* I just wondered about a couple of minor things. You say you are working on a critical bibliography--a linguistic bibliography relevant to your interest?

** Yes.

* I just wondered to what extent you anticipate making use of the work that's been done at the Center for Applied Linguistics, and also the ERIC Center in New York.

** Well, we have worked to a large degree from ERIC. We find it invaluable. We go first to the ERIC abstracts and when the abstracts are not explicit enough we go to the original article. This is where our single-minded question gives us a focus again. In the literature search it becomes: "Given this article, what is it that the teacher of underprivileged children need to know, to think, to feel, to understand?" As you can see, our concern is very much with the practitioner in the real life situation--where she is dealing with her youngsters. We are not concerned with other equally important but more removed problems, for example, system or institutional problems, because they are outside her jurisdiction. We are also not concerned with the problems of research (here) because they too are outside her jurisdiction. We are concerned with the applied questions--what can the teacher do to improve her lot, to what extent can linguistics help her perceive the nature of her problem more clearly, and allow her to operate with greater efficiency. As far as the bibliographical search is concerned, I should perhaps add, that we are not confining our attention only to articles that are expressly concerned with educational problems. In fact most of the material does not seem to be directly concerned with our problem at all. Thus we have to say to our searchers, virtually, 'in linguistics what are ideas that appear to be germane, whether the connection has been made by the person who has written the article or not'. We know it's a bit presumptuous but we think it's worth a try. But to get back to your question. We know of both services you mentioned and plan to take as full advantage of them as we can.

* Another question that is not immediately relevant. I am just puzzled by one other thing. How are you going to handle the part of the project in which you somehow evaluate and synthesize what you get from this meeting today and the meetings of the psychologists, the sociologists and so on?

** First of all we are going to treat each one separately. So the linguistics point of view will initially come out as an isolated interpretation. I think the task of synthesizing is going to be a demanding one and will obviously have to follow the separate productions. It may well be that as far as the training program is concerned, we only need a general synthesis that recognizes the obvious overlaps. It is likely that the training program would then have a linguistic segment, a social psychological segment, and so on. I don't really know at this point in time. You put your finger on what is a distinctly difficult problem.

* The reasons for my question was that there is some major difference of opinion between linguists and psychologists and I was wondering whether it would not have been valuable for a direct confrontation.

** I think it would be delightful and very entertaining.

* But not fruitful.

** We think not. The assumption that we made in deciding on our meetings was that we should have people who share a certain common background and who don't have to spend time, as it were, backing and filling in order to settle ground rules. I suspect that in the kind of confrontation between psychologists and linguists you are envisaging, *we couldn't take that for granted at all. We would have communication gaps--substantial communication gaps.*

*   *I wonder how eventually you will have this whole thing gel into some kind of unified conclusion.*

**   *It may well be that we can't gel it completely--that we'll finish up with a compartmentalized set of recommendations, some of which will be antithetical. But even to recognize the antithesis is to do something for the teacher--so that she is made aware of the fact that there are alternative ways of looking at things. This may be to his or her advantage.*

*   *I share Harold's feeling on this, but in defence of your position. I just attended a conference fairly recently at Madison. There were 50 people invited from various different areas. They were there for two days and talked and talked, but did not listen.*

**   *I think our principal problem for education is to get the linguistic message into education. I think it is also the problem of getting the sociological message into education, etc. At the moment there are barriers. One of the barriers is, of course, the training gap. For example, when you go to a sociologist (as an educationist) and ask for help, he says, "Aha, first you have to become a sociologist". This isn't terribly comforting to the educator who has already spent six or seven years becoming an educationist. He feels that sociology offers no salvation for him at all.*

*   *Is the sociological message (perhaps unlike the linguistic message) sufficiently clear, that the educator can get it without becoming sociologist? It is not obvious that the linguistic message is going to be all that clear. I'm not sure that educators can get it without really becoming linguists.*

**   *I don't know. But if it isn't sufficiently clear and a prerequisite of understanding the sociological message is to become a sociologist.....*

*   *But you are one--that's why I was asking you.*

**   *Oh. Yes, when I'm wearing my sociological hat, not my netural moderator one, I think it can be done. I think it is possible to establish a bridge. I think it is possible to short-cut a number of rituals that sociology itself would demand. I suppose there's a parallel between* *the present situation and the crash language training programs that were undertaken during the war. I believe it is possible but I don't know. One of our purposes, hopefully, is to find out.*

* *Could I ask the linguists in the room, to what areas of instruction do we linguists think we have something to contribute? I would first like to have the areas listed and then go back to see what the potential contributions are. Presumably reading is one that could be listed. Right? Do we all agree that that is one of the areas where we think we would be able to talk to the educationists. What are the others?*

* *Something that's being called oral language instruction. Which means something like teaching kids how to talk in Standard English.*

* *I think we ought to distinguish between those things which are specific to the disadvantaged child and those things which are part of anybody's education. I mean, there is no such thing as oral language instruction in most schools, is there? A kid who comes from a standard background doesn't get something called oral language instruction, does he? That is something that we have to add for the disadvantaged child, right?*

* *Oh no--it's taught in the elementary school, but it's focus is different.*

* *There is something called oral language instruction? Is it distinct from reading out loud?*

* *Yes.*

* *What does it mean?*

** *It means learning how to talk 'properly'.*

* *Facility in oral expression.*

* *That's true. Even in Junior High there are lessons on pronouncing the 'wh' in 'which'.*

** *But the presumption is that pronunciation is required in accordance with the middle class acceptable grammatical norm.*

* *Wait a minute. This is called oral language instruction?*

* *Right.*

* *Oral language instruction..... incredible! This strikes me as extremely curious. I must admit to ignorance here. My son, who is after all, 30 years younger than I am, has gone through a reasonably normal or conventional kind of education. To the best of my knowledge he has*

never had anything vaguely resembling this. I mean, speech hasn't been given anything like the kind of serious attention that is given learning to read or learning to write. Nothing like that has been given to speech.

* Right now we have a proposal before the State Board of Education that would make it a required part of education.

* How recent is this?

* Quite recent really. In the older focus on the written word, the oral was ignored. One has to develop oral facility too.

* Does that seem like a good idea to you?

** I would guess that oral language instruction tends to happen incidently and unsystematically.

* It is happening systematically by the virtue of the simple fact that the teacher is with them all day and he talks to them.

** But when a child talks in class he is subjected to correction.

* If they correct my son's speech in class, they'll hear from me. I think this is terribly bad. It sounds that what you are advocating is, exactly what he just said, that they should correct a middle-class child's English, what is more, they should correct it on some kind of norm (which probably doesn't exist anyway). Is that really so? Are you advocating that?

* No, I am thinking about the language aspect where the youngsters get plenty of practise in talking before groups and participating in discussion.

* Now you are talking about a presentation--a speech in front of the audience, is that right?

* Yes.

* Well, that is clearly distinct from the ordinary use of language. That's a very special use of language which you do have to have training in, I agree.

* All right, they're taught oral language at the Junior High School.

* That's not the sort of example that Roger was talking about.

* That's what I am trying to find out, what are you all talking about?

* The oral language that I am talking about is the sort that is geared specifically for the disadvantaged kids--who speak in one specific

way. What oral language teaching is trying to do, is to get them to understand that there is another way to talk.

* That's a second dialect--that is not characteristic of schools in which you do not have this disadvantaged group being taught, right?

* Only peripherally, if at all. You're right, it doesn't get the amount of time that reading does.

** But there is such a thing as oral language instruction in so far that if a child commits a phonological or grammatical error he is corrected.

* We need to be clear on this, is there systematic instruction other than occasional teachers saying occasionally 'Don't say 'witch' say 'which''' or something like that? In schools where all the kids are from middle-class standard background, is there systematic instruction toward a particular norm?

* It depends what you mean by systematic here.....

* The systematic teaching of reading, the systematic teaching of writing.....

* I would say the teacher behaves differentially to certain kids, depending on how they are behaving, and some of her behavior has an awful lot to do with speech. In St Louis for example, I am aware of a study where classes have been seen as containing peripheral and central groups. It shows that the teacher brings kids into the central group depending on how near their speech is to her own speech, and excludes them.....

* Then you must have some kind of standard speakers then?

* Well, they're Negro teachers too. My point here is that with regard to oral language instruction one of the major things we want to consider would be to help the teacher differentiate between her own consciousness of herself as a model, and, when she is not consciously being a model, but is nevertheless being a model.

* Very nice point.

* We are kind of talking about that here. When the teacher is consciously focussed on a lesson--when she is a model--as opposed, should we say, to the spontaneous behavior that transpires.

* What I am getting at is that we have somehow got to identify what is actually done. I have to admit that I don't know. On the whole I am theoretically oriented, I really don't know what goes on

in the real world of education. I am sorry, but I don't. At the moment I am trying to find out some of the facts, so that I will know where I can make a contribution and where I can't. It appears to me that it is possible to make it a distinction between two kinds of oral language instruction. I want to know how systematically this distinction is made in actual practice. In the first place we can distinguish instruction in the use of language in the formal situation, such as giving a speech. Clearly, it's all right to have instruction of this sort. It doesn't have to do with Standard language at all. It has to do with how you behave in front of an audience. How to feel sufficiently comfortable to be able to talk in a half-way rational fashion in front of such an audience. We are in a sort of semi-audience situation here. When I talk to a group of five, I don't talk the same way as I do with just one. Given a bigger audience, I talk still differently again. Right? We have registers, style levels, or whatever you want to call the different ways of behaving. They all have to be cultivated with conscious practice and correction and so on. Let's give this sort of oral performance some sort of name. Let's call it (this is an exaggeration) but let's call it 'training in oratory'--just to put it in a category distinct from other kinds of uses of language, all right? That can be taught and I agree that it is. Now, the second kind of oral language is 'common talk'. Is it also the case that the ordinary, everyday use of language, casual conversation on the playground, talking with parents at home, talking with peer-group, arguing with them, fighting with them, what have you--the casual use of language, is there some sort of instruction in this kind of oral use? Is there instruction in the language used in the ordinary everyday, casual way that is not directed towards disadvantaged children or towards 'substandard' usage? In other words, does the kid that comes out of my home say, or your home, any of you, does he get some sort of instruction that corrects his use of the language he has acquired from his peer group in the playground with the kids who have come out of the same kinds of home that he has come from.

*** Yes, but through a third alternative. You see, not all presentations in classrooms are of a rhetorical kind. There are a lot of 'question and answer' exchanges for instance, when the child says something. Now,* *if he violates the language norm that his teacher holds, then he is subject to correction immediately.*

* *Fine then, if there is, then it's wrong. How do we get at it? I am sure that almost any correction the average school teacher makes at that level shouldn't be made. I don't know whether the rest of you agree with me or not.*

* *I am not too sure that I agree with you. I can see when it could become a bit extreme, but not wrong. Let's take an example. When I was learning Finnish I found that I was learning to speak Finnish a little better because I was required to produce it 'extra well'. After a given point I could afford to get sloppy again so that I started to sound a little bit like a native.*

* *But we are dealing with a bunch of kids who are native speakers.*

* *Right, but now we are talking about the acquisition of skills or competence in producing and recognizing language forms. But when a teacher keeps focussing in on certain kinds of language forms (for producing a written form or an oral form or recognizing an oral form), if she emphasizes certain kinds of oral forms as more legitimate than others, then I'm not too sure that it isn't a good thing.*

* *I'll agree with the oratorical kind of teaching and the teaching of formal writing. What I am asking is, is it a good thing to have a kind of instruction and correction and so forth in everyday language usage that it makes it apparent to the child that he is wrong? All right, I'll say it..... what it does, I think, is breed linguistic insecurity into the whole goddamn population.*

* *Let's flip it over. Let's say we go into a classroom and a kid says "It don't surprise me that he done it", and the teacher says, "Now, you wouldn't want to say that, there are two or three ways to say it, 'it surprised me that you'd do it'" etc.*

* *What is the context? The child's talking to the teacher privately?*

* *Right.*

** *No*

* *But it doesn't make any difference--either way.*

* *If it's speech in classroom it's one matter. If it's private conversation it's another.*

* Well, the teacher calls on the kid. The kid says something and then the interaction starts. That's not a speech.

* Yes, but what does the teacher do. What she says is "No, no, don't say that, that's bad English".

* Oh, but now we are talking about something else. We are talking about the evaluative aura related to her exchanges with the kid. Not too much with her correcting them or focussing in on language per se and discussing pieces of language with them.

* I have no argument with the notion that part of what has got to go on in a classroom is the development of a sense of appropriateness with respect to different levels of usage. Such that "it don't bother me that he done it" is damn well o.k.--provided the context is right, it is damn well o.k. Anytime I am talking to a garage mechanic who talks that way, I would not hesitate to use that kind of talk--in fact I do it very easily. I don't ever want to be told that it's wrong, because I happen to know that it's viable in a certain range of style levels and usage levels.....

* But I'm not talking about that.

* But I do want to be told in the classroom how to make discriminatory judgements and to know when which style is appropriate. For example which style is appropriate to this discussion and which style is appropriate in the garage discussion. That is the question, how do you implement it?

* That is the crucial question.

** Now, there is a preliminary question that is assumed to be answered by you but I suspect not by education. Namely that language is contextually grounded so that you talk one way in one context, another way in another context, another way in another context, and so on.

* It's not widely held by educators?

** No. One of the things that we have to contend with is the fact that teachers themselves have an internalized norm about the proper use of language.

* ..... and that there is a proper use of language, that's what they have got internalized.

* That's right.

** O.K., but another point is that the Negro teacher of underprivileged Negroes feels it even more intensely.....

*   Much more.

**   ..... and she feels that if she allows her black children to use their own language, then in fact she is violating her mission as a teacher.

*   Some of the most self-righteous speakers of Standard English I have ever met, are middle-class Negro teachers. At times, because they had learned what right English is, and they were absolutely malicious in implementing it.

*   Because their insecurity is greater.

*   They are not insecure. It may have originated from their insecurity, but now they are so tough about it.

*   Yes, they are secure, as soon as you start talking about linguistic relativism they're enormously threatened..... almost violent about it.

*   In a class of Black American English, I have had Negroes come up to me and they were obviously under tremendous strain---you could see by their oral posture. They didn't want to demonstrate to me in any way that they would slip into something called Black English. They told me that it didn't sound good for me to be using Black English language and that I was doing a dis-service to everybody there, and just on, and on, and on. They even walked out of the classroom sometimes.

*   Well, for you to use it is really very bad because you are obviously not black---don't belong.

*   It's a most curious thing though that among all the focusses of Black identity and Black awareness that have been fixed upon, language is one that doesn't fit. Presumably because it is a status selection device. They are not aware of the fact that they can identify themselves with the use of language. They won't even accept the fact that language can be one of those things that identify them as Black.

**   It's all right if it's Swahili, but not if it's 'Non-Standard English'?

*   Yes.

*   Do you remember the woman from Imanuel College who spoke up at the Georgetown conference.....

*   Yes. On the Saturday morning the chairman asked for a comment on the speech. And she got up halfway back in the audience and said: "I don't have any comment on the speech, I have got a comment about the whole damn conference". She said: "What do you white people mean

sitting here, no Blacks on the platform, no Blacks in the program, talking about white Standard English, telling us this has got to be our Standard. We have got our own Standard." Well, she was pretty effectively answered by Bill Labov, but she nevertheless got up and left.

* She didn't hear the answer.

* What was the answer, as a matter of curiosity. It's not obvious what it would be to a Black woman making that kind of claim--that they have their own Standard.

* Well, the effective retort, even more effective than Labov, or Stewart or any one else could have provided, I saw given at a seminar workshop. Some woman got up and said that she was a social worker and she had never heard Non-Standard speech, that she didn't even know what we were talking about and yet she worked with these people all the time. And there was a Black principal there who then said she "agreed completely".

* She wasn't lying, she merely translated everything into her own speech.

* Anyway, the next day she (the principal) came around as this workshop continued and she said that she didn't know why she had said that, but as a matter of fact, she would admit such differences. But psychologically that first day was just very traumatic for her. The other Black person provided the only kind of psychological retort that carried any way with her.

* In the Conference, Bill Labov made the point that he has worked a lot with Blacks and Black militant leaders. They not only use meticuously Standard English themselves, but they are very, very strongly opposed to the use of the Negro dialect. They were extremely anxious that Standard English should be acquired.

* How general is that. There is a Black movement in Los Angeles that takes just the opposite viewpoint--the Panthers on the West Coast--I don't know how much more widespread than that it is. In fact, they have an effective, identifying way of speaking English, and they are proud of it. They don't want their kids to talk White English.

** How do they want to communicate with the whites, or don't they want to?

* They figure the whites can understand the way they are talking.

As a matter of fact, it's true, they can.

*   *I think that's quite unusual, Bob--not widespread at all.*

*   *In the schools especially, as soon as you get in the schools among people pushing for social mobility you see approval for Standard white English only. You immediately find completely negative attitudes to Black English.*

**   *It's extremely understandable to someone who has come from a different culture. In your own culture you pick up rules of procedure. You have got them pretty well under control, then you have to make a deliberate attempt to change these rules, to learn new rules in order to make good in the new society. Now when you get told at that particular point that the changes that you have made (somewhat traumatically) are no longer viable or are not as functional as you thought they were, then frustration, I think, is the inevitable consequence.*

*   *Some Blacks feel that it is quite degrading for us to think about teaching a course in which we would contrast Non-Standard or Black English with Standard or white English. (The term Black English is sometimes thought degrading also.) But the point is that such courses would not be skills courses, but simply courses to show the systematicity of Black English. They would in fact lead to a positive self-identity.*

*   *Courses for teachers or for kids?*

*   *For High School, for Senior High School.*

*   *For College?*

*   *It would be a College course.*

*   *You described a similar course a minute ago, Marvin.*

*   *Well, this one is a combined College, High School course. But what I am after is a Negro research collaborator who is not so up-tight that he can't learn linguistics and use Black English as a vehicle. I've found one and he is being trained as a black linguist.*

*   *We have got three coming up, it will be a few years before they complete.*

*   *There aren't too many available.*

**   *Later I am going to ask if you have some definite things that it would be possible to teach teachers about language and linguistics. In the meantime though, can I ask you a question. You have been focussing* on Negroes. Is there a comparable situation with the Indian? Is there a Non-Standard Indian English?

* Yes, there is.

* There is a kind of important difference. They are not mixed in the same schools.

* What usually happens is that you have a localized area where you may have a reservation where a kind of strongly Non-Standard English results from the juxtaposition of that particular language. It's not however, widespread throughout the United States.

* There are different kinds of interference from different language backgrounds then?

* Small Reservations, lots of different languages, 80,000 Navajohs, 20,000 Hopis.....

* It would primarily be a second language situation. It would be probably fairly rare that you would have the person who speaks English as a native language who had a markedly Non-Standard English which was the result of interference from his other Indian language background.

* I don't think so.

* I don't think so either.

* Yesterday I spent six hours interviewing people entering a 2-year training program at the University of Utah--a training program for preparing them to teach English in Indian Schools. Three of the people I talked to were former Vista volunteers who had spent their Vista period on Indian reservations. I got some very interesting and insightful information from them. One of the people was on Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota. And on the Pine Ridge Reservation you do have a Non-Standard English that is the Indian's first language. It's the result, of course, of the language interference in the previous generations.

* A sort of Creole?

* Yes. At another Dakota reservation where Dakota is still spoken, the kids have a kind of mixed lingua-franca..... in the school. Another Vista person was from Turtle Mountain Reservation. There they don't have Indian as a first language any more, but you do have this same kind of thing. Another Vista person had been on a reservation in Montana--same thing.

* This sounds like the Tex-Mex which is neither Spanish nor English.

* No.

* It's different.....

* No, Tex-Mex just doesn't exist--this is my campaign to wipe out Tex-Mex.

* O.K. Creolised Spanish doesn't exist.

* What it means is that these people speak unstructured language, that is a random mixture of English and Spanish.

* In fact it's Spanish with a lot of English words in it. It is perfectly good Spanish except they got a lot of longs words from England.

* The phonology is pure 100% Spanish. It's not just in Texas either. It's all up the coast and it's obviously Spanish.

* Many of the tribes have already lost their language--and they do speak English most of the time. But they have picked up their English from Non-Standard English speakers, so that most of them have Non-Standard English in them.

** Are you telling me there is a Non-Standard white dialect as well as a Non-Standard Black dialect?

* Yes.

* A Non-Standard--there are dozens of them.

* Yes, they range vertically on a scale too.

** You are now compounding the problem from the training of the teachers, aren't you?

* Vastly.

** Well now, given the complexity of the problem, what's the solution for training teachers who are going into particular areas? Is there a sort of universal method that can be used?

* I think the way you are going to have to approach it is rather than asking what are descriptively, and in detail, the characteristics of Non-Standard dialects, it is better to ask the question the other way around. Given a group of speakers of something generally accepted as Standard English, what features do they stigmatize as sub-standard? What features do they notice and react negatively to, in the various sub-standard or Non-Standard dialects? What is a long list of these features--and there are hundreds of them? (I don't know if you agree or not). You might then be able to work out a program in which you try

to encourage the use of language, the very active use of language, and in the course of using it you try to slowly eliminate those things that are certainly going to be stigmatized by the, what shall we call it, the dominant culture. I don't know if you can work that way or not. I'd just like to throw it out for discussion. But it's got to be done without this kind of idiocy on the part of the teachers as to absolute correctness. They have got to be aware that these expressions that they are gradually trying to eliminate are perfectly viable within other sub-cultures and it is their job to make the kids realize it. It's got to be a case that the pupil is not punished for saying these things. That it's O.K. for him to say it in certain situations, certain contexts, and so on. But in other situations, other contexts, different expressions, and uses are preferred. It should be put on that kind of basis--wouldn't you agree?

* Before the teachers can even get to the point of identifying these stigmatized features they have got to have some ideas of how to use tools for identifying them in some useful way.

* But you agree that there are stigmatized forms?

* Yes.

* If the five of us sat around would you agree that we could make a list, a very representative, accurate list of 100 to 200 things?

* First, I don't think there are so many, but more important is the question: 'Do you have to train a teacher for each specific dialect?' I think we would agree, you have to have some linguistic component in there, but the more important thing to do is to equip the teacher with the appropriate philosophy--an approach so that all these things can then fall into place.

* Relationship between sound and meaning is arbitrary. If a teacher once captures that notion then she can divorce language and all the symbols from evaluative social connotation.

* It's hard to get people to grasp that notion.

* The attitudinal thing is the hardest thing to teach properly.

* In the first grade, the name of the game, from the kids' point of view is, don't make any mistakes if you can help it. From the kids' viewpoint, if he opens his mouth and gets stepped on, then he won't open his mouth.

* So we have got re-education problems for teachers in terms of telling them to not do the thing they were trained to do--namely correct things. Then we have got to figure out a sequencing after that for building in the stigmatized features in a meaningful way.

** It looks to me as if you are subverting the teacher. For historical reasons, a teacher has feelings of superiority. She assumes she is expert. She assumes that her model is a perfect model. So if in fact you tell her that her language is not appropriate for the context in which she finds herself, she is in fact being told "You are not good enough". Now it seems to me that in order to preserve her sense of integrity what you have to substitute is the idea that she is now a resource person who can draw comparisons between the contextual relevance of language and in one context, and another context. So her continual concern might be with saying for example, "All right, you have made a statement. I understand it, when would you use it?" The kids would tell her and she would say, "if in fact you were in a different situation, say you were going to apply for a job, or something like that, what would be the way that you might be expected to say it then?" So that she would have to develop the children's own recognition of cultural relevance.

* That's right.

* The problem is finding the useful angle. Getting a job or something becomes meaningful maybe by High School.

* So what do you do at Grade School?

* Or at an impressionable age, 1st, 2nd and 3rd grade?

* With respect to teachers it's probably not so much the feeling of her own superiority, at least not with teachers that I have worked with, there is a sense of deep obligation. They feel that this is what they ought to be doing.

* A whole new attitude to why we correct things ought to come through. Teachers mark anything they can find. I have been looking at some papers lately just out of curiosity and found that not only do they mark them, they mark them in a stereotyped way that is probably not meaningful to the kid who wrote it. The notion of leaving a lot of things uncorrected just runs counter to the intuition of the teacher. We have to teach the teacher that she can leave a lot of thing unmarked,

but that somewhere along the line she can begin to list it systematically in a way that is hopefully related to some research to show us at what age kids could best learn specific stigmatizing.

* And if it turns out that stigmatized features of social dialects are not really learnable until Junior High School, then we have got to live with the idea that kids go on speaking Non-Standard until Junior High School.

* But Allen says you can do it at three and a half.

* You mean correcting at three and a half?

* Get them to learn a second dialect at three and a half.

** Are you suggesting that what in fact the kids are trying to do of their own volition and in rather primitive ways should be systematized. After all what do kids do in the classroom? They try to learn the classroom game.

* Let's also find out if the teacher's model really means anything. Maybe the kids don't use teachers as models..... and if they don't then maybe the most important thing about beginning school is that you learn some things--some concepts, some math and so on.

* A recent study of the acquisition of English shows that Spanish speaking kids in Antonio when they start in 1st grade, they're behind the Anglos. In 3rd grade they close the gap considerably and they are down to 80%. At the 10th grade it has slipped back down to about 70%. So somewhere, something has caused some regression.

* One of the things that we might consider is teaching the teacher to look at different ways to say things as paraphrases--as translation equivalents. Sometimes the pupils are better at this than the teacher is. He may in fact be ahead of the teacher, who can't understand him in his native dialect. I remember an example where a kid was reading 'this is his book' and it came out as 'this he book'. The teacher would reject that on several levels, not recognizing that functionally the kid read it adequately. If the teacher could recognize at these very early levels that people can say the same things only in different ways that are all equally acceptable!.... Teachers need some sort of training that teaches translation equivalency between language cultures and verbal behaviors.

* We have run in the face of Carl Bereiter's statements at this

point also.

* *Nonetheless, one thing that has impressed some teachers we have worked with is the fact of pointing out that when the kid can do that, it shows that he had developed a receptive bi-dialectic mechanism already.*

* *Very nice.*

** *Maybe this is what the teachers have got to understand--that they will not be ahead of the kid as far as his native dialect is concerned.*

* *Teachers always test on the basis of production. This is the way testing is always set up, and they virtually disregard recognition competence. They don't look at the recognition competence side of things.*

* *There has been some research that supports this where sentences are given in Standard and the kids repeat exactly what they heard. Labov has done this kind of thing.*

** *Would you like to elaborate this point a bit, I think it's a very important one.*

* *When these kids come to school, they already have receptive competence in a lot of Standard English. They can understand the teacher now. But when they try to produce forms themselves they are not Standard forms, and the teachers says "Ah, these kids just don't know Standard English". But they can understand it--and we can show this by this tape repetition stuff. They are given a Standard sentence and then immediately come back with a reproduction but in their own dialect.*

* *If you take the Non-Standard, can they come back in the same way?*

* *Yeah, and they combine the same way.*

* *Well, you could for some. I'm sure some would not.*

* *What about the teachers understanding the kids?*

* *Now that we have got school desegregation going on where teachers go into classes with Negro kids, this is one of the first things they start complaining about. "I can't understand these kids". Now they could if the kids talked real nice and slow. But it's all this phonological stuff that goes on that is beyond the teacher. They just can't understand it.*

* *It's also fashionable to admit that you can't understand--like saying "I never was any good at math".*

* There must be a negative bias to begin with.

* We all know that Black and white Non-Standard English are equally deviant, so there are no grounds for rejecting one set of deviations and not the other set of deviations. It's the type of deviation that's important.

* Well, I can understand the position that some of these teachers take. I have worked with tapes of 1st grade Negro kids. Mostly they are talking to the interviewer and it's no problem understanding them, but occasionally when they are talking peer group stuff it is extremely hard to understand at the first hearing. You have to listen to it a couple of times sometimes--although this would be true of any situation.....

* After all, it is in a different dialect, and a fairly considerably different one when you get down to details. But I can play you some tapes in Scottish dialect that I guarantee you won't understand, and they are English--real English. You have to listen to them 50 times before you begin to catch more than a few words. There are lots of examples like this, it wouldn't have to be Scottish dialect.

* British--it's hard to understand it at times.

** Come on!

* New Zealand is the worst!

* You can wander round London and you can't understand a damned thing you overhear in a pub. You know, you go in for a beer, just to try to understand it.

** I agree. My first experience--a completely unintelligible one--was with an American Southern telephone operator. I finished up just saying "Yes" to everything!

But what are the implications of all this for the training of teachers? Is it some sort of sensitising to dialect differences? Is it some sort of intensive training in dialectology?

* I would say to you that getting this change in attitude, difficult as it is to effect, will not be done without having a large mass of factual information about both vertical and horizontal range in American dialect variations. I think we should get some regional variation knowledge in also. It is true that in a given social group and in a given place things can bunch up so that you can say that this particular group had its own sub-dialect. Still even that has its place on the

range. It is not something here with a big gap--nothing in it with nice Standard English at the other end. It's a scale.

* *This implies that unless you develop some background on the history of language and on the way children acquire language, teachers won't understand the problem.*

* *There is a whole body of language data that would provide useful information.*

* *I think we have the same problem here as they have in many areas where you have a long range problem and yet you have an immediate job to do. That's why you find such strange things as compensatory education (which everybody knows is not what to do). What you really need to do is overhaul the whole system. But you have to do compensatory education and overhaul at the same time. It's not a matter of choosing between the two. So we are back to the problem of changing teachers. And we know how hard it is to change teachers. I had 30 teachers at Georgetown this year and I am sure all of them were comfortable about an attitude of change (sophistication is something else again), but you know with 30 a year you have a long, long haul before you get any place. There are better strategies than teaching 30 a year. Along with that approach should be some compensatory kind of training, where the teachers were perhaps given highly programmed stuff (I'm speculating here). Whether she understands what she is doing or not or whether the attitude is right or not, would be beside the point. If the teacher is programmed right the kid can be improved in some way. I don't like that, I don't like what I am saying much, but it seems to me we have got to think along those lines.*

** *May I suggest that most of the problems we are talking about now have been created because in fact the teacher has been trained and her attitude has been developed. One advantage we have in our program is that we are going to be dealing with brand new teacher training entrants.*

* *But the people who are going to be training them--some of them--are going to come out of the previous system. We have been training teachers who have got the attitude that they have at present, right?*

** *But our trainees are likely to be savagely and severely influenced by linguists.*

* Savagely and severely, that will be interesting to watch.

* Can we try it lovingly and gently?

* That is not the linguists way!

** Can I ask you a question. You appear to be violating one of the assumptions teachers make, viz. the conditioning assumption. If you say that it may be possible to discover at what level you start your introduction of the alternative form of language, you are saying in fact that it's all right to let them develop habit patterns of language according to their peer group, and that we don't have to get worried about all these 'bad habits'. Now is there some language research that bears on this, for instance, that suggest the optimum times for learning 'foreign languages'?

* There is research, but I don't quite know how it's going to help here because first of all, they have already learned the language (as such) when they come to school, second, language is not a set of habits in any way that psychologists understand, because habit involves repetition, right--virtually identical repetition with reinforcement. Right? In no sense whatever is language ever a matter of repetition.

** I think the choice and use of words is a matter of repetition for instance--and the choice and use of structure.

* You know, you can't make that precise.

* The notion of habit seems to me largely irrelevant--unless you are changing pronunciation, is that what you mean?

* Look, when the kid comes to school he has got a fully developed set of phonological rules..... totally fully developed.

** O.K., but aren't you saying that he has developed certain habits? Cognitive habits if you like.

* I don't know what cognitive habits are, but if you want to say it correctly, 'he knows how to use the language'.

* Articulatory habits.

* He already knows how to articulate.

* The question he was asking was, is there an age at which something happens where it becomes too hard to learn a new language? Of course there is--everybody knows that. There is a linguistic hardening of the arteries around--somewhere around puberty. Lennerberg says it's somewhere around 13 to 15 that the biological foundation of language lies.

I think that's about right. After that it is damned hard to become a native speaker of a language. Before that you drop an infant or early teenager down in another society, and you don't give him the opportunity to use English all the time. Then he *has* to learn the other language, and he will and he will learn it perfectly.

* See the whole point that's in question here is, how efficacious has native language teaching been anyway? That is, that's the whole point.

* There is every reason to believe it is totally worthless.

* That's what I am saying. We are calling into question that whole set of circumstances that surround teaching Standard Language as it is conceived at the Colleges of Education.

** O.K., take it to pieces.

* There is no proof that any kind of teaching they are doing is necessarily producing outcomes.

* In fact, it won't work.

* People are unable to demonstrate that if they have goals for use of Standard language, the techniques the teachers imply necessarily realise those goals.

** O.K., given the fact that we may not have sufficient research evidence to tell us what the nature of the error is or what the ideal procedure would be, would you care to hazard a guess as to some of the things that might appear to be reasonable at the moment?

* That's a good question.

* We have to back up on a couple of things. One of them is the business of habits and whether letting them go on reinforces bad habits.

* Well, the first thing is--I don't know--I don't want to talk to the point of habits right now. For one thing, I find that teachers don't emphasize principles of behavior or something like that, they emphasize the listening thing. I suppose it's kind of related to habit problems. Habit we take it as some sort of generalized rule we are operating under and we do it automatically. Well, with classrooms, when they try to change to verbal behavior--language behavior--they don't deal with generalized rules. For the most part they are dealing with ad hoc unorganized, ungeneralized items. They don't show systematic relationships between the kinds of things we are playing with in syntax. They just pick a thing here, talk about how you shouldn't say that or

they pick a thing there, and say that this is what you should say and there is no systematic treatment on a generalized level of language structure, that's all there is to it.

* Joan Barritz who was working with me for a while, knows how to talk to the establishment. She was trying to get across the concept of difference versus defect. And they refused the article not on the grounds that you would expect, but because it disagreed with the assumptions of the establishment. I have never heard of a rejection based on anything like this from any reputable, from any academic oriented, any group.

* Doctrinaire then?

* Yeah, you couldn't find any way of breaking in.

* After you've gathered all these fine ideas from us, taken them to the educationists, they are just going to reject them because they don't agree with you.

* That was in the distant background behind my earlier question. Who's going to do the evaluating and synthesizing of the results of these various symposia.

** Well, theoretically it will be under my direction. Presumably it will be effected by the experience that I have in each one of these consortia.

* Are you going to make Marvin a Kommissar for Linguistics.

** He is obviously going to be consulted closely--I presume at the present stage, because the dialogue has to be with educators, that my educational background will lead me to have something to do with the writing up.

* Are you having all these other meetings about the same time.

** No, we are having them in January. What happens in the meantime is that some of the literature search for each of these will have been completed.

* Let's go back. To the question of how the Standard language is taught. Let me put it this way. How did the group of us sitting around, how did we achieve a presumably reputable command of Standard English? To what extent did our achievement of that command come about--was it something that was done systematically by the school?

* You asked two questions. How is Standard English learned, and how is it taught? The assumption, I would gather, is that if we could

?

figure them out, maybe we could say how we would go about teaching the Standard language to those who are less close to it to begin with.

** Can I put it another way? It seems to me that there are two questions that we should confront. One is the question--the problem of teaching language and English per se and, you know, the general reform of that system, and the second one is whether there is anything specific that relates to the underprivileged situation. I am at your mercy. What should we do first?

* Most of the things that can be done to the underprivileged probably ought to be done for the others in some different way with different means.

* If we find out how we learn Standard English it will be all easier to say what are we going to do about teaching Standard English to those who don't come equipped with it to begin with. I am not sure what the schools do, systematically to teach Standard English. I know what they talk about but I don't know what actually gets across--what succeeds. They generally have lots of exercises, they have grammar and talks and they talk about grammar--we all know this--and they do a lot of reading of essays and novels and plays and so on. And the pupils write a certain number of papers which get corrected. But I don't know how much of this has any real bearing on the acquisition of Standard spoken English as distinct from the acquisition of something else called Standard written English--the ability to write formal English or something like that. Now I think that the stuff that is done, has considerable bearing on learning to write formal Standard English, but I don't think it has much bearing on the fact that you and I speak something that can be called Standard English while a lot of other people don't speak that something. I am damned if I know how that differentiation got made through the school. Did it get made through the schools at all?

* Not systematically. Because you can find that many of our college people, even our college faculty, have come from lower middle class background. You will find that they often will have retentions in informal speech, which they will not use in a formal situation such as talking before an academic group. Now there are some people like this who do it unconsciously but more often academics are aware of the contrast and make the choice deliberately.

* Now, is their command of this formal spoken Standard English really a sort of direct transference from what they learned from formal written English?

* Sometimes it is, yes.

* Where else is it taught, how else is it taught?

* That's what I am trying to find out. How else do they come into contact with it?

* Well, some teachers will correct orally, but as you said a while ago, on an item by item basis. They'll correct a kid for saying "He don't", they'll not correct a double negative, that sort of thing.

* But you're told a double negative is wrong. That's a positive. And if you are properly motivated you'll probably work on it till you get rid of it.

* I really very strongly suspect that almost all the learning of Standard spoken English is peer group oriented and--in terms of modelling oneself after those people who are admired. The kid picks the ones that are liked and ones that he wants to join, he knows they talk that way. This much he learned on an observational basis rather than through any systematic teaching in school at all.

* I was trying to think when you opened the door to anecdote a minute or two ago--how did we really learn to do this.

* I really seriously asked myself for the first time--how did I?

* I came from a working class background.

* So did I.

* I used to use 'he done' and 'he seen', it's very common--and it wasn't till I was at College I began to realize actually there was any real reason for not doing so, then somebody said "you made these mistakes in English". I said "What mistakes?". I wasn't conscious that there was anything wrong with it. It wasn't till somebody laughed at me or criticized me or gave me a D, an F or something like that, that it really meant anything to me. That was in writing, in the papers. I think I got the 'r' out of 'wash' at least temporarily because people laughed at me.

** When did you become sensitive to language at all? Were you subject to any sort of constraints or direction in the use of language at home when you were a child, or was language just taken for granted?

It used to be believed of the middle-class that parents were language conscious, and engaged in continuous correction and advice. Now, were you not exposed to that--anything equivalent?

* *I remember correcting my grandfather's speech one time, and getting whacked for it.... But no, I don't think there was that sort of thing. I was not conscious of it--I am not aware of it now. If it was done, it was very subtly, which doesn't sound like my parents.*

* *Yeah, I know exactly what you mean because my Dad--I guess by your definition of working class he is not working class--was an engineer who worked with working class people in the oil fields and identified himself with working class people and talked like them. He does to this day--he is still living.*

* *That's a pretty good functional substitute.*

* *But still, in terms of income level and education and so on, he's presumably some sort of middle, lower, upper, middle class, I don't know. But anyway, I am sure my Dad never corrected me in his life. Now my mother, who only had high school education (he had a college education), she was conscious of these things--but she was usually wrong!*

* *'Between you and I, not between you and me'.*

* *That's right. Exactly.*

* *She was hyper correcting all the time, so by and large any correcting she did would put me on the wrong track. My father never corrected me because he couldn't care less. He used to think that you could talk the way you felt like talking.*

* *I think it's a matter of motivation, that's what we are saying in a way. One recognizes the relationship between certain kinds of behaviors in the goals that one has, and in the middle class families perhaps it's not so much the fact that parents may or may not correct their kids but there is promise held forth that there are things to be achieved and done if one's behavior is of a certain kind.*

* *I think it's almost entirely informal learning that you've just been describing.*

** *Yes, but language is one component on which a great deal of attention is directed. Now, I am right in assuming that the underprivileged kid comes to school (a) motivated to succeed in the middle class culture and (b) not at all sensitive to the fact that language is* something that you pay attention to, language is a tool, language is instrumental.

* Do we know anything about this introduction to language?

* I don't know.

* What age?

* When he starts school.

* How sensitive is he to the kind of indices--differences and so on.

* The Negro kid is pretty sensitive.

* He was saying they come to school not sensitive and I was wondering if that is true.

* We haven't done anything with anyone younger than nine or ten years old, and they are becoming sensitive by then. For example (the problem is measuring--measuring in terms of subjective reactions, we are using such things as occupation scales)--nine and ten year olds can do almost as well as teenagers. At the age of ten he can judge race as well as teenagers. At the age of ten he can judge the race of the speaker.

* It sounds like they are pretty sensitive, because they are clearly not taught that in school.

** Yes, but are they made sensitive to the ideas that words carry meaning other than the actual semantic meaning?

* In school?

** Yeah.

* No, I think they have had to learn that informally. There is no way before the age of nine that that can be taught in school.

** I think that they have been told the difference between the peer group use of words and the in school use of words. They have been socialized to recognize that the teacher has one set of standards that she applies and that if you want to get rewards--how do you say it--if you want to get adult approval, then you use the teacher's system or else. You can forget about it outside the classroom but inside the classroom, use it.

* How does that explain the fact that they can identify different races by voice alone?

** Because they spend a lot of their time outside the classroom.

* That's the thing--they have learned it outside the classroom, and I don't see what evidence you have that they have learned anything

about the use of language inside the classroom. Because if they can learn something as subtle as that outside the classroom, then all these other things we are talking about they can learn outside the classroom.

* I think they generalize. They go in the classrooms and the situation is structured in a certain way. I had an informant who came to work for me at the Center for Applied Linguistics. The first half term he nearly always generalized me to the classroom and the situation. Then as things wore on it became easier and easier to become more informal. But my dress, everything else, the way I spoke, all generalized. But I don't think anybody ever told him that he should speak to me the way he spoke to his teacher.

** But if he is sensitive he is sort of intuitively sensitive.

* That is right. People operate this way. They see cues in their environment and they try to adjust to the environment. They behave according to the cues they are getting, and I think this doesn't get taught. It's kind of like a language, as far as I can tell.

* I do too.

* It's as much a part of the things a person learns because he is a human being, as a fact that he learns the language when he is exposed to it.

** Language is one of the interpersonal behavioral components?

* The question you asked earlier, how they teach Standard English. I would teach it quite differently from the way I see it taught. One of the ways that I would teach it, would be to stress abstract manipulation entities. That is, I would play games--kind of like I do anyway in looking at syntactic structures. I would try games with changing things around and I would show that there are class inclusive relationships and I would continually relate this abstract game to actual language but emphasizing the abstract game. Because what I want to do is show more and more complex paraphrase possibility for the languages the kids already control. I want to push in the direction of more formalised or stylistic control when it comes to writing it.

* What you are really talking about is enriching the range of linguistic command.

* Well, I think that is the goal.

* I agree. But you are assuming that in fact he controls the

language already.

* *Oh, sure.*

* *To perfection as far as it goes, and that there are ways of extending this control so that it is broader and richer and so on--which involves a continuation of knowledge that he already has. It is not a new kind of knowledge, it is not new--it is not much different.....*

* *I don't know.....*

* *It's only quantitatively different.*

* *Situationally also.*

* *No! He already controls language in terms of a number of situations. You are just extending the number of situations so it's quantitatively still. Within his own six or seven or eight or nine year old speech he already has situational differentiations. All you are doing is giving new situations.*

* *All right.*

* *All right, fine, so it is still quantitatively not qualitatively.*

** *Aren't you also going to expose him to the fact that he is doing it..... something that he is unaware of at the moment?*

* *Yes, I think one should.*

* *I want to ask a question. What constitutes new knowledge? Learning another language is qualitatively different. I was playing my kind of game with this class of students. We started looking at the 'or' conjoinings and we got to a sentence like"Either John is coming or Bill is coming". Now, it turned out that as we ran through these sentences, most of them were rejected by the pupils in the class except for one form which was quite acceptable, appropriate and legitimized in their eyes somehow. This happened to be a highly reduced conjoining.*

* *They rejected the sentence "Either John or Bill is coming"?*

* *"Either John is coming or Bill is coming". They didn't like that. They wanted to say 'Either John or Bill is coming". They wanted one reduced form, one linguistic form that is always to be used.*

* *Now wait a minute. Is that..... really..... you are bewildering me. Was it totally unacceptable or they simply prefer it?*

* *No, they understood it, but they claimed that they wouldn't themselves ever use it.*

* *They wouldn't use it? But that is still not clear.....*

* *But this is the point though, isn't it. In the classroom the teacher wants them to use forms like this. They won't use forms like this but that doesn't mean that when they read them they don't have a recognition competence. But they don't produce them. Now, this is my question. What constitutes new knowledge? First of all, I would agree that they evidently have a feel for all the underlying elements, but there are some forms involving those underlying elements in certain structures that they accept and others they don't. The others represent an extension of the repertoire of possible realisations. Well, is extending the repertoire of possible realizations the acquisition of new knowledge or not?*

* *I don't challenge the notion that it's new knowledge--I make distinction between quantitative expansion of knowledge and qualitative expansion of knowledge.*

* *And how would you.....*

* *The one we are just talking about I consider to be purely quantitative.*

* *I am not too sure I would.....*

* *Mind you, this is not a negative term that I am using, but it means it requires one kind of approach as distinct from qualitative. If it were qualitatively different it would require a different kind of approach.*

* *What about another example? Let's say that some 8th grader doesn't control pseudy-clef sentences. Would we want to say that if we teach him to use pseudy-clef sentences that this is a qualitative or quantitative leap he has made?*

* *Quantitative, but--necessary. Look, there are two ways of expanding one's knowledge of language--one's native language. One of them is, you learn transformations that you didn't know before.....*

* *This wouldn't be classified as new knowledge for you?*

* *Sure it's new knowledge, but it is not like learning a new language.*

* *O.K.*

* *Which would be qualitatively different..... much? Different kind of learning?*

* *In that you won't have to worry about new phonological....*

* There is nothing in the nature of what you are learning that is distinct from the nature of what you already know..... more of the same.

* The abstract entities that you control, you already control in a reduced way.

* That's right. Exactly, that's right.

** To what extent do you want to make your abstract entities explicit?

* I want to make them quite explicit--maybe not through the teachers, I don't know, I don't know.

** I think this is a question we shall have to confront all the same. The extent to which we have got to turn our teachers into linguists and the extent to which they in turn, turn their kids into linguists.

* I don't think there is anything necessarily bad about turning somebody into a linguist, whether they are kids or teachers.

* It's probably a matter of what level of performance you want. They don't have to be able to argue about theoretical problems.

** If in fact, language is rule governed behavior, the question is 'to what extent are you going to expose the rule system to kids and teachers'?

* I think you should surface the rule sytem as early as possible. We are talking about curriculum changes for teaching teachers, so why don't we talk about it in an innovative way. I'd say that these things are interesting and important and that this is an area of curriculum innovation with regard to teaching teachers that we think is viable.

* First of all, let's make it very clear that the position that you are representing is not a position that you are going to get linguists in general to agree on. I think you will find other linguists ready to agree with him, and you will find a number like me who will flatly disagree. I see absolutely no point in doing what the Paul Roberts series does, in any form, whether he does it well or badly, I don't care. I see absolutely no justification for presenting a bunch of formulas and trying to show how these formulas are then realized as real words and sentences, and so on in language. I see no gain in the ability to use the language we're trying to communicate through this kind of teaching.

* I think the Paul Roberts series and that kind of teaching in general is capable of doing an incalculable amount of damage.

* Your example was unfortunate. I mean, to say that that was the sort of thing I was talking about is unfair.

* I would concede that, I didn't quite say that, but I had to take some concrete case. Now, you were saying--teach them rules.

* No, I didn't. All I said was "teach them to manipulate abstract entities and we will relate these".

* Abstract entities means symbols, category symbols?

* That's right.

* That's what Roberts does.

* No! He presents them but he doesn't necessarily teach the kids how to manipulate them.

* He certainly has a lot of transformations that they are supposed to apply.

* I have never used the Roberts, so I probably should pull back here.

* Am I wrong..... this formula story?

* Absolutely right..... formulas all over the place.

* It's a whole series--3rd grade, 5th grade--a whole series.

* I haven't used it, nor attempted to implement it in any way so.

* Has anyone read Wayne O'Neal's review of it?

* Is that the "Roberts Rules of Order"?

* Yes.

* Yes.

* It's in the Urban Review--not where you would expect to find that sort of thing.

* I would say--I don't want to involve you personally at all. Let's say it differently. I would say that the presentation of explicit notions of grammar, transformational or any other kind, is done about as effectively (and then implemented with drills of various kinds, showing how these formulas are supposed to be meaningful), in the Roberts Series as I can imagine it being done. But you have to make one pedagogical assumption, namely that the teacher is a total idiot, and must be given no flexibility what-so-ever. I will grant, that anyone who looks through Roberts' materials would have to say that he had done the thing well, but that doing this well results in a fantastic disaster pedagogically. It just is not the way to go about it.

** Why? How do we know?

* Er--I am not just going on Wayne O'Neill's view of it. I am going on the reactions of a very large number of teachers in California.

* Well, maybe they didn't have training in linguistics--to know how to use it.

* Well, my point would have to be that there are two things that you can say about the material. One of them is that they are so highly structured that if teachers merely follow instructions page by page, letter by letter, you don't *have* to know anything. The teacher can be a robot and teach from that material the way it is set up, right? Now, the other extreme is that if he wants to use them imaginatively, he has not only got to know some linguistics, he *has got to be* a first-class theoretical linguist. And those are the two extremes. Either be a robot and use them exactly the way they go, or you have got to know so much more than the author of the series did. You have got to know so much more about English syntax than Paul Roberts did.

* (You've got to know that there are auxiliary rules that don't work.)

* You have to know a great deal more. O.K. Now, obviously neither of these extremes is a happy one. The teachers don't want to be robots and they are both unable and unwilling to become first-class linguists themselves, so the material is inevitably getting a terribly bad reaction.

* I am not too sure that the alternative is to become first-class theoretical linguists. I suppose that a little more training might go a long way.

* It takes a lot more training though. The reason it takes a lot more training is that Roberts presents a specific grammar of English very dogmatically, a grammar of English which is, at very many points, wrong.

* Well, this allows me to take exception to the earlier comment that you made which was that you couldn't visualize this being done any better.....

* Methodologically speaking it couldn't be done any better. You don't have to agree with me.

* One of the basic things that many linguists would fundamentally disagree with on what Roberts was doing is that much of what goes on in the generative transformational approach makes certain basic assumptions about the competence of the child and therefore that the

most highly valued teaching approach ought to be one that is inductively oriented. Which is exactly the opposite of what Roberts has done.

* You stated just beautifully one of the main points that I would like to insist on and that is; what one has to teach in terms of enriching one's grasp of the capabilities of language, is the content of the grammar, not the grammar itself. Let us say what the grammar is saying about the language, that these sentences are related, that the clef sentence is related somehow to a simple sentence for example, and that a clef sentence furthermore is related to a pseudo-clef. There's the clef, the pseudo-clef and the simple sentence. Three sentences. "He built a house", simple sentence. Pseudy-clef: "What he built was a house". Regular clef: "It was a house that he built". O.K. Now, these are all related somehow to the simple underlying sentence and there are probably other ways of getting emphasis too. Now, all of these can be dealt with as related sentences---they can be talked about, and should be talked about as related sentences. I don't think you ever have to give the children a rule but if you do give them the rules, you give them rules after they have seen the set of relations, not as Roberts does, give the rules first and then tell them to derive relations from looking at the rules. An insane way of doing things.

* I got put in this camp if you remember.

* Yes, all right. Fine--but partly because you said something, you know, you put one foot in this camp all by yourself..... but.....

* All right. I'll withdraw it.

** Can I ask a question? It seems to me there are two messages coming up: one of them says you should teach kids to do, and the other says you should teach kids to know why they are doing it. It seems to me you are saying you should teach kids to know why they are doing it. There's a rule system underlying it. What you are saying is that if you give them the facility in the use of language then you are accomplishing a sufficient objective.

* That is not a sufficient objective for all education. I take it to be a sufficient objective for the language arts part of what we are talking about. Now for becoming an educated man, I think it is terribly important that they should also understand what he is talking

about, namely what the nature of this thing..... this human language is. Really it should be a central subject in the schools but this is a particular prejudice of a linguist. I am not sure how far I want to push that. I happen to think that kind of knowledge is important.

* That's not a skills knowledge.

* Not a skills knowledge--it's an understanding.

* And that's not in the present curriculum at all--so you have to say what it is going to replace.

* ..... terribly old fashioned, very clear pedagogical requirement of being able to communicate with the kids about their language at some point. You need a vocabulary that you can communicate with.

* O.K. I'll buy that. I think we are in essential agreement over this. We want them to manipulate and we want to be able to refer to the things they are manipulating.

* We don't want to teach them the Meta-language first.

* Yeah, well, I would agree.

* Well, there is a lot of real nice material that has come out recently; where they started even at first grade level, teaching grammar but teaching it through, and presenting it in frame sentences, and asking the kids to show what kind of word would you put in that blank. It is a sensitisation process, it runs to about the second grade and then they review it and say now we are going to call these words nouns, and these words verbs, and these words adjectives, and they play around that a little bit and it's just a very gradual build-up.

* There may be some material of this sort. I guarantee my children did not go through them.

* Oh no, they're too recent for that.

* Too bad--he hates grammar.

** Did your idea get developed or interrupted? You were about to say something and then it.....

* About the sequencing of things.

** I don't know. It barely started.

* I was about to answer a question of Bob's a while ago, when he said if Roberts had been done properly, would it then have had any value. But I think you got around to that later.

* I accept Rudi's point that you do have to have a Meta-language for talking to kids about their language, and I think furthermore the study of the nature of the language for its own sake is worthwhile.

* The nature of the Meta-language?

* The nature of human language. It may be the only way you can talk about that, may be by talking a little bit about the Meta-language.

* Sure.

* That's exactly what the Meta-language is. A representation of things that we consider to be universal in the nature of language, I hope.

** You are talking about your own addictions?

* That's my own addiction. That's the other point.

** Is it possible to generate equal enthusiasm among human beings?

* The inference being..... that we are not representative.

* Unfortunately it's true, we are not.

** I think you have got a very good point, because if you look at curricula now and the kinds of trends that are being illustrated, you find exactly this sort of thing happening. The development of rule systems and recognition of rule systems and the ingenious utilization of content to fit into the rule systems, so that in fact kids get knowledgeable about how to think, for instance scientifically or mathematically. Maybe even how to think sociologically. And what you are saying is 'Let's make them sensitive to thinking linguistically'.

* That's really what we are asking. If we had to describe some sort of ideal situation it would be a situation in which every child in America somehow became aware that there are different varieties of usage, that all presumably equally good for their purpose. As well, they would come to know that some people are clearly more articulate than others--they use the language more effectively than others and that one of the goals of an individual who is oriented towards that particular kind of activity in the society, is going to be to acquire this sort of articulateness. They would also learn that the use of language of one type--relative formal language--is not better in any absolute sense than other uses of language. The fact of the matter is simply that, that particular use of language is accepted by the dominant culture for certain purposes..... O.K.? Furthermore, I would like to see all of these kids not only become aware of all these differences and

sensitive to them--so they perceive them themselves, they notice them themselves, they adapt to them themselves--but also that they develop a vocabulary for talking about them when they notice them. I think this would be a nice ideal society if everybody could develop them. But you see, the school teachers themselves don't have any of the capabilities that I have just listed--not a one of them.

** Well, if we can in fact enumerate some of the desiderata then I think we'll get to the question, what does the teacher in training need to get at. Now, Rudi mentioned earlier some intriguing publications that suggest gentle ways of going about familiarizing children with some aspects of grammar. Now, question..... as you see the situation at the moment, is it conceivable that some ways of gradually introducing children to the rule system that you have been talking about seems feasible? To put it another way. When I was a youngster I learned about nouns and verbs and adjectives and eventually I learned about different kinds of sentences and about parsing and so on, all of which I have conveniently and happily forgotten.

* It's the happily that bothers me.

* In your actual performance I would disagree with you. In your writing you go to great length to try to be stylistically interesting. Which in effect is to do the kinds of things we were talking about as the first stage, i.e. going in the direction of acquisition of the Meta-language. I am not so sure that you haven't felt a great need for the kind of competence that was built up, or your teachers attempted to build up.

* He obviously has this competence at a very high level, and the question is, how did he acquire it. I suspect once again that the learning about nouns and adjectives and so on, had very little to do with his acquisition of it.

** What does have to do with it? What is the informed guess at this moment?

* Lots of readings, desire to express oneself that way, and a knowledge of possible alternatives.

* Motivation for participating in a verbal community somehow..... we don't know how it is acquired--this was a question I asked a while ago. How did we ourselves acquire this ability we all presumably share?

And I really don't know the answer.

* First you have to want to.

* We know that.

* That's part of it.

* That's quite true, but that's true of almost anything, so we haven't made any contribution by saying "you've got to want to".

* Thanks.

* Even in riding a bicycle--that's got to be one of the essential things. I said it because Tax said a few years ago that they were trying to teach English to a bunch of Indians who didn't want to learn English. So the conclusion of the Carnegie study was that if they don't want to learn, therefore they fail.

* With Black English it could be absolutely central.

* This is one reason we are playing around with this notion of teaching Black English content as a system because at least they would be aware of its systematicity and wouldn't feel--embarrassed.

** It seems to me you have got to seduce two sorts of clients: one, the kids, so that they want to learn, and two, the teachers, so that they want to teach it.

* Oh, I think they want to teach it--it's just that they don't know what it is and how to do it.

* Wait a minute, what is it they want to teach--do they want to teach Standard English?

* That's the overwhelming desire of teachers--to teach Standard English.

* Let me take a different tack--and make a proposition. If x is initial behavior and y is terminal behavior. I dont' think anybody has come up with an explicit statement of both x and y for children's pre and post linguistic conditions. I don't think we are there yet.

** Could you make an explicit statement of x and y.

* I think we could. There could be materials that progressively take you (I don't know how far they would go), but they could be further worked upon to lead to more complicated structures and repertoire extension. I think that's possible.

* We can express the terminal behavior very easily. It's the way we speak and write.

*

* No, that's not fair.

* That's what Marvin was talking about long ago and when he said that we haven't had the terminal behavior described. Suppose you want to teach the handling of negation structures in Standard English to some kid who has Non-Standard negation structure English. We haven't had until very recently any clear ideas what the sets of negation structures were and how they operated in Standard English.

* But surely they were adequately described for the purpose you are talking about, way back

* The interaction of anything and all that business.

* But that is all described in Pope and Meyesterson and so on.

* But not in a way that I think that you can use it in the school.

* I don't agree. What description do we now have that we didn't have before, that gives us adequate information.

* Let me give you another example although it isn't Standard. Recently I have been working with auxiliary forms across sentence boundaries in particular, across 'and', or 'but' conjoinings. It turns out that there are certain kinds of co-occurrence relations here which, I think, if I were going to teach Black English and the efficient use of the auxiliary forms and that, I would be quite handicapped without a description of them. That is, in order to use auxiliary forms in a course in Black English you'd have to be aware of these rules. I think that otherwise you would be listing forms and telling people to memorize them without any generalization.....

* I am claiming that you don't have to give people, who are below the age of 16 or so, generalizations. All you have to do is give them a few examples and they will make generalizations which are better than any generalization that any scholar can make. That's true of negation too. I mean, it's absurd to claim that we have to have a formal grammar of negation in order to be able to teach what the rules that govern Standard English negation are--for practical purposes. Someone who doesn't have them will internalize the rules correctly, simply if you give him a list of 100 examples--even fewer I suspect. Those examples are available in a full range, full richness, in grammars going back at least to 1800 (and probably before that).

* You're suggesting that we don't need descriptions at all, all we have

to do is to expose people to behavior. Well, we know that's wrong, because we have been exposing Black kids to white teachers.

* No, I don't claim that we have to expose them to behavior without exposing systematically.

* All right, now you are around to his position.

* I am saying that the fact of Standard English negation could be systematized by anybody in this room without ever having read Klaymer's book, simply by going through a list of about 35 examples or by looking at some of the older texts.

* No, I disagree. In order to be so concerned about relationships, in order to provide paradigms, in order to make order, in order to..... to infer generalizations of any sort, I think you have to have crucial cases, and I mean.....

* Crucial cases? Get them out of Meyesterson.

* Himes says that language is so neat because the data is so available and it's all out there--all you have to do is kind of ingest it by being around it. Well, I would say that it might be true for a native speaker who knows the language from the beginning, but for a grammarian or a person who is going to learn another language, I think that they need to have some direction.

* There's a recent paper by Robyn-Laycock, challenging one of the central assumptions of Klaymer's rules, namely 'some--any suppletion'. She says they are not suppleted and gives very good arguments for showing it. This knocks Klaymer off the deck with respect to this particular item in the rules.

* I would claim that any six year old child or even five year old child is capable of internalizing for himself more nearly adequate generalizations than the entire science of linguistics is able to come up with yet on any grammatical point.....

* Agree perfectly.

* So you give him the data from which you make the generalization.

* But that has to be systematically ordered for his growth.

* But we don't have to have Klaymer's kind of approach for systematic ordering, do we?

* It's not just a matter of saying "Don't do that, that's wrong, use that, that's right".

* You don't say that.

* Well, now wait a minute. You are jumping from my claim that we don't need Klaymer's kind of detailed analysis of negation--you are jumping from that to the counter assumption that all we need is what has been done in the schools, which I never claimed at all. I am saying that you don't just say "we don't say 'we don't"; and "we don't say 'I don't want none'" etc. This is obviously not sufficient. I mean, I'm in complete agreement with you on that. What you have got to do is get a representative sample of well formed sentences in the Standard language and perhaps a representative sample of non-well formed sentences in the Standard language, so that the pupils see what to reject. But you do not have to give them a rule--they will correctly extrapolate the rule. O.K.?

* You are talking about different things, I think. You are talking about the usefulness of a linguistic description for the sequencing of pedagogy.

* I am claiming that the rule, namely the technical set of rules in Klaymer's paper are beyond comprehension of most linguists. 95% of all linguists will find it impossible to filter their way through that set of rules. I am saying that accurate description (if it were accurate, in fact, it is inaccurate at several points when you do filter your way through it), will not give you anything that you need for the purposes we are talking about. The only thing that will give you anything that you need for the purposes that we are talking about is a systematic organized list of the properties of negation in Standard English.

* Deciding what represents systematic and organized.....

* That's true..... You've got to know something about rules in general.

* Now, going out to teach what you have to teach in the form of your systematic set of rules and your systematic set of data. That is another problem.

** Question. I am a poor, insensitive, non-linguistic teacher of Grade IV kids. I have a list of (quote) approved forms and a list of (quote) disapproved forms (given the cultural relativity). And suddenly somebody produces something that isn't on the list--what do

I do with that?

*   Faint.

*   No, surely not.

*   ..... Is it the case that you also as a poor, uninformed, naive teacher of elementary school children--whatever you called yourself.....

**   I didn't use those adjectives, but go ahead.

*   "Linguistically naive..... benighted?"

*   O.K. Anyway, whatever your characteristics, you don't know linguistics and we gave you two lists of examples, and you panic as soon as someone gives you something that is not on that list. This relates precisely to the point that I was making about the ability of the human being to extrapolate the rule correctly. If you were given a list which is relatively representative of well-formed sentences on one side, and a list of the corresponding ill-formed sentences on the other side, (not just any set of ill-formed sentences, but those that were paired one to one) you will--the teacher and the students--will both extrapolate correctly to a rule which you will not be able to state. It will be some place down inside here. You can't pull it out and state it in a nice formulated fashion or anything like that, you will none-the-less make the correct extrapolation, such that if I give you then two more sentences, one good and one bad, you will tell me which one is bad and which good. And furthermore you will be able to tell me which one of these good ones the good one is like, and which one of the bad ones the bad one is like, and you can only do that because that sentence is not on those lists, on the basis of having internalized some general properties that these sentences over here share.

**   Are you suggesting the kind of approach that most people use when learning statistics--namely to look in the book for examples that are like the problem they have to resolve?

*   It is essentially different from that because the sort of sentences that you are capable of handling is an infinite set.

**   But the set of violations.....?

*   The set of violations is infinite too.

**   It is infinite?

*   Sure.

*   It is even 'infiniter'!

* That's right, that's literally correct--the set of ill-formed sentences is a larger infinity than the set of well-formed sentences!

** O.K., then the only problem is to get as representative a set of examples as you possibly can.

* That's where the kind of knowledge on negation that Rudi was talking about is absolutely necessary. I'm not challenging that kind of knowledge. That kind of knowledge is absolutely necessary. Whether the particular rules are correct or not, that's another question.

* We can always knock a set of rules.

* Yes. So the kind of knowledge that is represented in a good descriptive grammar of English, let us say, is absolutely essential for selecting the sets of well-formed and ill-formed sentences that you are going to use as a basis for making this sort of distinction for the student. But let him extrapolate the rules himself. Then if you want, you can give him some guidance towards the extrapolation of a correct rule. I don't even object to that, but actually laying down the rule and saying that this is the rule will invariably get you into trouble.

* You'll find in working with these kids, they have fun when you give them an utterance and then you give them another that is like it but is slightly ill-formed. They can tell you it is ill-formed right away. And so we know that they are operating with an internalized rule even though why the utterance is ill-formed may not always be apparent. But you can keep providing more and more examples until finally they can surface the rule they are operating by.

** I am still a Grade IV teacher, I am still linguisticly naive, but I am intelligent and I see the two lists and the examples, and I say to myself "why", what then?

* Yeah, but part of the orientation that you were supposed to get at the University of Missouri in your teacher training program, was that the question "why" is answerable only in two ways: (1) as an historical answer--here is where these constructions came from in Indo-European if you like, or (2) because in this sub-community of the total society they say it this way, and they accept it, and if you say it some other way they don't accept it. Those are the only two possible answers to the question why.

* That's got to be part of your emotional orientation.

** Is there not a third that says there is some rule underlying this that.....

* That is his second.

* What the moderator is really saying in his "why" question was "why are you presenting it this way?" How does this relate to how children learn language and makes you think children can extrapolate like this?

* That's different.

* Yeah.

** You complimented me--I didn't.....

* You are not asking such a delicate question?

** No..... Yes..... I am still an intelligent Grade IV teacher--but not that intelligent!

* No, you were asking why is one list marked O.K. and the other list not marked O.K.

** Yes.

* If that is the question then the only answers are the two answers I gave.

** No. I think there are some hidden answers like, because linguists have investigated this, and given the fact that they have examined the structures of language, this is their conclusion.

* Ah, but the data the linguist starts from is language use. The linguist did not conclude that the right hand list was good and the left hand list was bad. He takes that as a fact from observing what people in fact do. Then he works out his generalization on the basis of that. His generalizations don't determine which set belongs on this side and which set belongs on the other side. That is given to begin with.

* That is established by your social, economic correlations.

* That's usage.

* The two answers I gave you were, people do it this way in their sub-culture, and historically..... it developed that way.

** Good. This gets us back to the first major point, namely, that we should have some understanding of linguistic conventions.....

* ..... what it means to say that something is 'right' or 'wrong' in language. That's what goes back to the University of Missouri orientation program. What you should do is establish an emotional bias in your teachers so that they will not violate the notion that a thing

is right because people in that culture say it that way.

** O.K., O.K.

* ..... people who say it in another way are using another rule.

** O.K.

* Very good.

** Now, let's get your subtle question!

* It had to do with the acquisition of language culture. The reason that you would organize it this way instead of saying "don't use double negatives", is that we believe very strongly that this is the way children learn language naturally.

** Are you also saying that the system itself--the rule system is so complex that in fact if you are going to introduce it to children or to people, they have to have quite an immense amount of background knowledge.

* No, No, No.

** No?

* No, what they have is an innate capacity for a particular type of learning which is apparently incredibly complex.

* The kids already have this by the time they get to school.

* Exactly. What would be complex, would be for us to state in formulaes or in ordinary language, anything even roughly equivalent to what they have already got built in up here.

* We talk about grammar fragments now. We don't talk about writing grammars of natural language any more.

* A six year old child knows more about the language--the grammar of the language, than any linguist has ever managed to describe.

* That's not even a little bit of exaggeration.

* Teachers refuse to believe this when you tell them.....

* That's one of the things that has got them. Put it down, put it on the record. This is a point we haven't made and which has got to be made. Part of the orientation of our teachers has got to be that not only is usage inviolate (you know, somebody says it this way, he is a legitimate member of such and such a sub-community so it's O.K.). That's one of the things they have got to learn. The second thing they have got to learn is that the language is so unbelievably complex that linguists have now concluded that there is no way in which this complexity could be mastered by a sort of inferential learning--by inductive learning

at all. Humans must come into the world with extraordinarily complex innate preconceptions about the nature of language, and they sort of fit things into place as they are exposed to the data. They internally put the rules together to make the language system work. They infer these very easily because the nature of language in the human race is a highly pre-specified thing.

* If you want nice analogies for this kind of pre-set thing, you want to talk with physiologists and psychologists who know about perception--who can point out--there are literally hundreds of examples where you see things they way you see them because your eye is structured the way it is or because your receiving device is pre-programmed, not because of the way things are out there really.

Language is like that too--very much like that. Language is structured a certain way because you are a human being not because there is any sort of necessity in the way the data is organized, or in the way it is presented to you. In fact we organize it in some very strange ways if you really sort of look at them. There are hundreds of ways in which a grammar could be organized that no human language ever uses. In fact there is an infinite number of ways in which one could write grammars for natural languages none of which are worth a damn and none of which represents the way in which human being organize language. They organize language in ways which are so clearly given innately to human beings, as human beings. If your students recognize this as a fact they won't be quite so surprised when it turns out to be difficult to write grammars, for example, simple rules for negation--it's very difficult to write a rule for negation in English.

* Anyone who has been in this linguistic field for more than five years reaches the point where he totally despairs of being able to characterize the syntactic or even phonological properties of anyone's speech. Yet somehow by the age of five or six a child has figured out the whole linguistic system and is using it perfectly--up to a certain level of complexity. It is true that there are some types of construction that he doesn't use at that age, but these, I insist, are additive--more of the same kind of thing. He just hasn't gotten around to them yet. They're not qualitatively different from what he has mastered. Yet even the speech of a six year old child is more complex than any

linguist has yet been able to come close to providing. I think any linguist that has been in the business more than five years will admit this. When they first get out of graduate school they still have an idea they can write a grammar of the language, but when they've been around a little bit longer they learn it can't be done even at the level of a six year old child.

* But when you're talking about language as code only. If you add language as behavior to it.....

* Yes, if you add the rest of it you're really dead. But I'm talking about it only as code--just the syntactic rules and nothing else.

** Would you elaborate this point for me--as a code and as a behavior.

* Well, language as a code is sort of like it's cognitive function as opposed to language as behavior with its social function. You add the dimensions of sex, race, and other kinds of variables to it.

* And if you throw in the community aspect of it too, you are writing a grammar that represents.....

* Let's put it another way. If you throw in the business of style switching which all of us do all the time.....

* All of the time, spells communicative competence.

* I was going to use the phrase which we use in talking about usage--"the whole complex of the situational context"--this is extremely complex, much more complex than the most of the persons who talk about it appreciate.

* This is part of what I mean by style switching.

** We are somewhat sensitive to this now. In our video-tape studies (this is a digression) of classrooms, there appear to be factors coming into the situation that are non-verbal. For instance, factors concerned with the location of the actors, with attitudes towards the opposite sex, concerned with a variety of things that would never come out if one looked solely at verbal transcripts of the interactions.

* I just wanted to add a little bit more discouragement to the already discouraging tone.

* I don't think this is discouraging, this is another orientation that the teacher has to have.

** Yes, I think this is fine. If we were to say to the teachers, there's a great magical linguistic mystique out there that is perfect and understood by the select few, then in fact we would be giving them a philosophy of despair. On the other hand, if we can be honest and talk about the complexity of the thing and the fact that there are a great multitude of problems to which they may not have been sensitive before, then in fact we're doing them a great service.

* At the same time, I don't think we dare take the position that because the last word has not been said, we don't dare start doing things.

** Right.

* What we want them to do is participate in making the vast number of crucial observations that are yet to be made---about the nature of language learning, the nature of the system that children do internalize.

** We do come back to the question then, what expertise do we give the teachers? It seems to me that the expertise is now a matter of being translators of the problem rather than solvers of the problem.

* A not very realistic answer to the problem here would be that the teacher at best gets what I have elsewhere called a grocery list of features about Non-Standard. They appear in various places. The most recent which is in Elementary English on Zeduacola language of North Florida or something. It is a grocery list that includes a whole bunch of things. They lump together all plurals and verbs as "s's".

* Terrible.

* Awful.

* The alternative to that would be to give the teacher a bit more (not a chapter that would appear in Labov) on one of these features, but maybe some condensed intermediatory stage which would show them that there are certain kinds of things involved in any feature--such as its linguistic environment--something about its history. I think we need to expand what we're giving them at the moment so that despair can be reassessed as simple realism.

* It's not despair to say that we're incapable of describing the knowledge of six year olds. Quite the opposite. We are saying that this kid has a fantastic reservoir of ability. Regrettably the teacher has hitherto been trained to misbelieve in it.

* Good, beautiful. That's the point exactly. And what the teacher has got to do is recognize this ability and bring it out--give it a chance to emerge, give it a chance to achieve some significance.

* *Oh sure, she not only disbelieves in it, she discourages it in a sense. She holds it down.*

* *The thing about the more complex structures and the extended repertoires is that the child essentially controls the manipulatable elements in his head already. Once the whole idea of manipulating these things become a tangible part of his experience, he can usually start to do it himself. That is, he can begin to see the relationships for large numbers of sentence elements that he might not have done this far before.*

* *And practice, there's no question that he needs practice to learn to become more and more fluent and more and more articulate in using this greater range and variety of construction.*

* *At this point I would like to raise the question about the applicability of certain things that have been done on an experimental basis with respect to the application of techniques and procedures derived from this other field--English as a second language field. There have been various things done--not always too successfully, but they have established some things perhaps--like the very early experiment in South Carolina, and certain other experiments using pattern practice and procedures, techniques of English as a second language--foreign language teaching in general, even to the use of a language laboratory where the youngster listens, repeats the correct form, listens to his own performance, compares its accuracy with the one on tape, and that sort of thing.*

** *Could I ask one general question at the moment. It seems to me that the whole tenor of discussion has focussed on language as communication. Now at the risk of getting out on a limb, it seems to me that one communicates at different levels. For example, it is possible to convey a meaning in crude, direct form, and it is also possible to convey it with extreme elegance. So where does facility in language elegance come into the deal.*

* *Isn't that part of what we were talking about earlier--this business of greater articulateness and greater persuasiveness, greater effectiveness, greater variety in the available repertoire of devices one has in using the language. That's a part of teaching Standard language. That's part of the whole educational system.*

* *I was a little surprised by the direction of the question. In fact I expected you to go back in the other direction and say; well, if communication combines meanings with overt behavior forms, what kinds of other overt behavior forms are to be linked with meaning* *__besides__* *the verbal, that's what I expected. I would have supposed this is just as legitimate an area for discussion.*

** *O.K., but I think what I'm saying is that there are different kinds of behavioral contexts in which the form of communication varies and I need to know to what extent we are going to limit our contexts to; (a) the classroom, (b) peer groups, (c) the culture, (d) the vocational? To what extent are we going to talk about literature, and about associations with the history of the language, as it is commonly regarded as a reservoir of culture, and so on?*

* *I think we can make a call to research with regards to these things. But I think we're already limited. I don't think we really know how Blacks interact with each other in peer groups--at least not so as to instruct Blacks on how they should interact with their peers. And I'm not too sure we have enough information (we may have some) but at least I'm not aware of enough materials to make it possible to instruct on these things.*

** *Would you want to?*

* *Can I make sure I understand your question a little better?*

* *Let me see if we can list some things: first of all, we've got the question that we were talking about a while ago; Standard versus Non-Standard, at the simplest level (like the double negation bit--O.K.?)*

* *Let's make it the* *__range__* *of Standard and Non-Standard.....*

* *All right, fine. Surely there's a range.*

* *Nice point.*

** *__That's__* *something to teach too.*

* *Yeah, but maybe you'll have to teach to me. Because my experience tells me that* *__one__* *slip from Standard, just* *__one__* *slip in a whole conversation is enough to tag you. It's a very discreet thing, I don't think it is a continuum.....*

* *The message* *__forms__* *themselves may vary though.....*

* *Oh, the message* *__forms__* *may vary, I agree.*

* *In a single, individual, intra-personal grammar, so to speak, you*

would have the range so that a person could in one context be speaking almost entirely in the Black code, and, as he moves through different contexts, he speaks in other codes.

* *Now you're talking about switching, code switching.*

* *Well, now, I don't know. You see that's the point here; are you going distinctly from code A to code B, or is the case that you are using elements from A and B.*

* *You're going to mix them I agree.*

* *Well, are you going to say that every time you inter-mix something from B when we're speaking A, that that's really another code?*

* *I would be inclined to do it descriptively at least--I'm not sure. He undoubtedly is speaking of it as a gradation when there's more or less mixture, but I would be inclined to think of it as something discrete each time.*

* *That makes code switching sort of meaningless.*

* *I don't think so. I think you can switch pretty regularly.*

* *It's an interesting academic problem. I will say Standard to Non-Standards. Or Non-Standards to Standard. O.K.? We don't really want to fight about it. I mean, it's not something of great importance to me.*

** *Do you want to put an 's' on Standard too?*

* *What?*

** *"Non-Standards to Standards?"*

* *Yeah, I said that earlier. O.K. So I've got to loose. He brought up a very subtle, very sophisticated thing. We were talking about how we were going to teach Standards to speakers of varying degrees of Non-Standards (is everybody happy?), and he brought up the question of what you and I were talking about to some extent earlier, really degree of adequacy within any one of these Standards or Non-Standards--as you said, the degree of articulateness. (Now this is really a different parameter, that is the point I'm trying to get at.) That is, how good is one in the use of a dialect? Let's call it a totally restricted dialect--I mean it's only one level on the Standard-Non-Standard scale. It's only one level geographically speaking, no variety, no code switching, nothing else. What you seem to be talking about is how good one is in using this? Presumably a study of literature is going to be effective at any point here.*

** I'm not sure whether that reflects the idea I had, but I'm not sure that my statement reflects the idea that I'm trying to get across. Let me give an illustration. It's very obvious in my field that if you write for a journal in this country you have to present your material in a certain way. It is a way that is bald, abrupt, to the point, and does not reflect any literary elegance whatsoever.

* (This reflects one of his axes).

** Now if on the other hand you publish in the same field in England or Australasia you can get by with some literary curlicues.

* Sloppy writing! Throw in a few pink roses.

* Let him read Romance philology for a while.

** This conference is now terminated..... I suppose I was really talking about different cultural contexts again, but we're now defining them differently. One being.....

* Different norms.

** Yeah, O.K. The question that arises is, what different ranges of cultural contexts have we in mind, and to what extent are some of the norms that are reflected in the 'flowry' contexts etc. to be exposed?

* I think I have the idea. That is, in one context you have one set of norms and in another context you have another set of norms, and in another context you have another set of norms and so on. When we go into the classroom and start teaching, are we going to be concerned with teaching the norms for each of these different contexts, or situations?

** Yes.

* Now, I can see a possible infinitude of possible contexts. So should we try to generalize it somehow. The point I tried to make earlier when I gave the example of Black children's peer group communication was that we don't know what the norms are.

* I claim these are cross-cutting parameters. Look, the degree of rhetorical skill is a measurable parameter within any Standard and any Non-Standard.

** O.K.

* This is a scale, and within any one of a bunch of different levels of Standards you can talk about how good one is at the use of it. These are totally cross-cutting parameters. Now, the only one we're

probably going to be interested in dealing with, is degree of rhetorical skill within the written language--and with the best of the spoken, best of the Standard spoken language.

* *So you're selecting one kind of context with one set of norms?*

* *I am saying that is one target. I'm saying that this parameter is really going to be relevant.*

* *That's the important one.*

* *That's right.*

* *So that's to answer his question by saying there's only one normative set of values here and that we're going to reject the others.*

* *No. That I didn't quite say.*

* *I think, you know, you're going to have to admit them as part of the bridge operation. Youve a kid let's say, who is good at 'rapping with his buddies'. You are going to try and teach* ***another*** *kind of rhetorical skill. He's already got great rhetorical skill. In the past the teacher has totally disregarded this.*

* *We agree that we are not going to teach the middle class kid how to 'rap'.*

* *.....or to teach the Negro kid who doesn't know how to rap too well, how to rap better.*

* *That's right.*

* *I don't think that's the school's job.*

* *I thought that that was what he was asking.*

* *I did too.*

* *But what I would claim is that that kind of rhetorical skill (in any one of these Standards or Non-Standards) will almost certainly transfer itself as he acquires the necessary skills. I would expect this to happen.*

* *But only up to a point. I think you have to recognize here the need for (just as we have recognized the need for contrastive linguistic study) a contrastive rhetoric. I think the contrastive rhetorical analysis that might well be made could be sharply differentiated from the other study of language--the Negro Black militants use a quite different rhetoric.*

* *You're damn right they do.*

* *All right, but this is their own rhetoric. It's not a bad rhetoric.*

It's a different rhetoric.

* I agree. But the point is that those same Negro militants (such as Cleaver, you can name any two, three or four of them) have become distinguished independently as writers in their own right, have transferred their rhetorical devices to the Standard language--and with great effectiveness, with great effectiveness. Now the point is that it doesn't make sense to talk about these contrastively because these have now become rhetorical devices in the formal written language, just because these guys have used them. These guys have brought them over into the Standard language in their writing.

* That's not spoken rhetoric, that's written rhetoric.

* A lot of the stuff that would be given the kids to read and so forth would belong to different rhetorical traditions which they will not understand, or they won't be able to recognize.

* That's a very nice point. But you're not going to teach them about this different rhetorical tradition by giving them a contrastive analysis of rhetorical tradition--a la Cleaver and a la Hemingway or somebody.

* Don't you have to work into it in a pedagogically 'natural' sort of way? First of all, in learning the Standard language they're going to learn respects in which it is different from their own--a Standard dialect, they're going to learn, they're going to notice respects in which it is different from the way they talk--O.K.? And likewise as they are exposed to more complex sentences in this Standard dialect they're going to notice which are more highly rhetorical--which use different devices. They're going to notice the difference between those devices and the ones that they would themselves use naturally or would have heard used by their Clevers or Karangas, or what have you. I don't see that this is something that you can take out and isolate and study independently.

** It depends on whether it is a deliberate attempt to recognize the rhetoric of the language. Let me illustrate. It seems that kids brought up on "look John, look", "see Jane run", and this jazz, and who always know "Spot" as a dog, rather than say, "a four-legged bundle of fuzz" for instance, (no, "fuzz" is the wrong term--"fluff"), have got that certain attitude towards the use of language that immediately restricts it to bald, bare communication. Now I suppose my question was, to what extent do you want to recognize what my value judgement earlier called the elegance of language?

* I'm claiming that elegance of language is a matter of greater rhetorical skill-and that greater rhetorical skill is a goal to be desired--and that it is something to be taught. But it's impossible to teach it except on its own terms within a single dialect--within a single variety of the language. It would be a manifest impossibility to start comparing rhetorical styles at several variety levels of Standards and Non Standards. Really, that's asking too much. Rhetoric becomes a meaningful thing only at the most formal level of the language. The formal written language is where rhetoric becomes an important device.

** I wonder..... you gave the very nice illustration the other day of--'git-go'.

* What?

* 'Git-go!'

* 'Git-go', you haven't heard that? I've been working with time adverbs and auxiliary forms. I was in class one day and I said, "Well, this kind of time adverb always goes with this auxiliary form". Then a Black student said, "Well, it would be interesting to find a time adverb in Black English that isn't in Standard". And I said, "Yeah, yeah", and got a bit excited. He said, "Try git-go". And I said, "What?" (Like you did). "How do you spell that?" Well, he didn't know how to spell it, but we finally got him to say "git-go" but almost without any 't'. Well, as it turns out, this means 'from the beginning', like, "you been rapping from the git-go, man".

* Very nice.

* So it means 'beginning'?-- sort of a translation equivalent of 'from the beginning'?

* But it has a peculiar significance, and as far as I can tell, it might spread.

** Well, now I would predict that the Blacks have a series of alternatives for that--translation equivalents for that. Now, presumably to use this 'git-go' under certain circumstances is to be rhetorical.

* But that is not a rhetorical device, as I understand the notion of rhetorical device. 'Git-go' is a lexical item which exists in one

dialect and not in another dialect--and for which there's a translation equivalent in other dialects. It would be a rhetorical device; if I, the speaker of Standard English, started throwing that in in order to salt up my presentation. Then I'm using it as a rhetorical device. But in the dialect to which it is native, it's not a rhetorical device. It is just a word that means 'beginning'.

* The way some people will throw in some Latin quotations for example.

* Right, that's a rhetorical device.

* ..... to create in those that you are addressing the impression of a certain kind of what.....

* ..... 'learnedness', in the case of the Latin quotation, 'down-to-earthness' in the case of the use of Black English.

** Then maybe the question I should ask is to what extent do you want to get.....lexical richness into language teaching?

* That's very much a part of it, yes.

* Lexical richness and syntactic richness--(depending on the word you select. Some people talk about pragmatics or something like that)--in the context of usage. In effect, where language and its use meet, I would strive for some awareness of it in all these areas.

* Last week, some of the themes I read as an experiment were written by Black college freshmen at Michigan State. I would say they reflected an awareness of the need for supplying lexical richness but their way of doing it is very strange. It came close to being fancy talk--lots of 'tion' words.

* Malapropisms?

* ..... in the oral language but not necessarily in the written. I didn't see malapropisms much. With some Black people we've talked to we do get lots of that.

* There's a real reaching for lexical richness.

* There's a notion that it ought to be there but.....

* It's,.I think, it's misdirected with regard to derivational processes, because they end up deriving words with derivational suffixes that don't work.

** Now, hold on, because what you're saying is that the rule systems that they have internalized are sometimes fallible.

* But you see, we are *now* within the *lexicon language*. This is

precisely the point, unlike syntax, where in general the rules had to be relatively exceptional free, the derivational part of the lexicon is just loaded with exceptions. There are some fairly general rules but any rule you can find within the derivational domain as to what suffix you can add to what noun, has as many exceptions as there are items that follow that rule. And in some cases, the number of items that follow the rule are very few--there are only five, or six, or seven in the entire lexicon. Yet it's still a rule. It's a subtle one. It's a tiny, tiny, minor rule, yet we can still extract some generalization. This is characteristic of derivational processes. And so one would expect them to be learned almost item by item rather than as general rules.

* There are fewer models.

* Very few models.

* Just a word now and then, here and there. The temptation is to start generalizing. It is rather like kids learning the plural.

* Let me give an example. Try to think of how many items form abstract nouns with the suffix 'th': warm, warmth; grow, growth; broad, breadth (cool, coolth is one, extended by analogy really). You see, it's a very small set, but it's still a real set. But you can't just take the next adjective that comes along. Let us say 'hot' and form 'hotth'.

** Which explains my delight in words like 'washeteria'.

* What about 'abundanty'.

* Beautiful.

* * * * * *

** In the time that intervened between when we left and when we got back here, other points have come up that are of a more general nature. It seems to me that given the three things that you suggested, we should now look at; linguists versus sociologists versus psychologists, to see whether in fact there is a confrontation or what the relationship is. The implication of your earlier statement was that both Bereiter and Bernstein have a different perspective.

* Why don't you summarize their perspectives as you see them.

* Bereiter has a deficit in knowledge about language.

* *Well, what claims does he make on the basis of his deficit in knowledge?*

* *All I know I have got second hand from Labov's paper. He says that Bereiter claims that five year old Negro kids in the ghetto do not have any language--they talk in grunts.*

* *They are incapable of formulating coherent propositions because they say things like "he sick" and "he workin" etc.*

* *I have a quote from Bereiter's 1966 work, the title of which I can give you in a minute.*

> *"The language of culturally deprived children is not merely an under-developed version of Standard English but is a basically non-logical mode of expressive behavior. In order to overcome this illogicality and under-development, the writer urges teachers to proceed as though the children have no language at all and to train children to speak in fully explicit formal language."*

He argues for unelliptical responses to questions such as "The squirrel is in the tree", not "he is in the tree", and surely not "he in the tree".

* *That's pretty extreme. We can't take that seriously.*

* *But this book which he did with another colleague, Engleman, is an extremely influential book among people who are offering Head Start programs and the like. It's their Bible.*

* *Bereiter has had a program published recently by SRA, in reading. I haven't seen, but I've heard about it. He has a tremendous amount of influence.*

* *How did he get all this influence?*

* *He is very persuasive.*

* *He has a good rhetoric, I guess.*

* *Teachers seem to want to buy it, that's the thing.*

* *Of course it's an easy thing for teachers to believe. It means they don't have to do any work now, it's just like starting from scratch. And "everybody knows how to teach a language when you're starting from scratch". So there's no special problem, it's just an old, familiar problem. I guess this is one reason why they are easily persuaded.*

* *I should think they would be turned off by some of his techniques such as putting kids in dark closets if they don't answer properly.*

* *He has an on-going experiment with pre-school kindergarten and first grade children.*

** I take it from your comments that his basic premises are not linguistically valid. Is that right?

* They have no basis in any set of facts known to linguists. O.K.?

* The quotation I gave earlier was from an article in a chapter in a book by Fred Heckinger who is the editor of Preschool Education Today, published by Doubleday in New York, 1966. Bereiter's article is called "Academically Oriented Preschool for Culturally Deprived Children".

** I presume we don't need to discuss the details of the inaccuracies, it is sufficient at this stage to document the fact that you gentlemen view his linguistic theory as highly questionable.

* No, you said you didn't want any details. You will not have any trouble documenting it in the literature. I think Labov takes him on in some detail.

* Yes, it's an ERIC document called "The Study of Non-Standard English". It's just been written in the last couple of months.

* At the Georgetown round-table, Labov's speech was dedicated to, or directed at I should say, Bereiter. It said something about how logical is the Non-Standard language....

* Yeah, that will be published shortly.

* May I bring up one other thing too, since you are going to be having a bunch of psychologists in shortly. Roger Abrams was talking to me the other day. He'd been to some meeting in New York where there were a number of psychologists or professionals discussing this Jensen report on Negro intelligence. He said apparently that the majority of the psychologists at this session were buying this.

** No. I don't think this is the case. I've just had a communication from one president of one psychological association repudiating the Jensen article. He asked us to get the repudiation publicized in the local press and so on. Jensen may be bought by some but there's a substantial amount of psychological opposition too.

* This bothers me, because Jensen did not deny in that article that there could be environmental influences. He said that he thought that they quite probably did exist but he was more interested in hereditary. But he didn't deny the other. And people tend to overlook that when they read it. I'm not defending him. I don't want to be caught in that position. Nor did he really give proof. He said, what he says

in the article 'isn't real proof'. He just suggests that it may well be the case. Now people tend to overlook these things when they read it. I was very disappointed at Wisconsin where people who were all concerned with what he had to say didn't remember that he also had these two fudges.

* To make the claim even if you hedge, is to present a limb upon which you want to stand. That is there for the public to see. I mean, I would agree with you, that was the only thing he could do and still be anywhere acceptable to the scholarly world, was to fudge. But nevertheless the position in itself didn't take language into account.

* One of the things that seems not at all to have been mentioned in the few critiques I have read, is that even though he was testing here and in Liberia he was still working within a cultural group. There's a fair amount of cultural similarity between the American Negro and Liberian Negro. So if he had gone to a radically different cultural situation where.....

* Not really cross-cultural.

* Right.

* It gives the appearance of being cross-cultural, but it really isn't.

* So he doesn't take language into consideration. He doesn't talk about for example, the fact that you can devise tests which white middle-class kids would do very poorly, just in terms of vocabulary.

* This is another big area we should have something said about--standardized testing and language. It is fantastically important. John Connely at Fredonia State University of New York reported in AERA recently that he changed one word in the Iowa tests of Basic Skills (a reading test). He changed the word 'mongrel' to 'cur dog', for a bunch of West Virginia kids, and increased the reading skills of a certain number of them (about half) something like three months. I don't know how to react to that. I mean, I don't know what it means to increase somebody's reading skills three months. That in itself is a problem. But whatever measure they're using, if you can change one word in a vocabulary.....

* I think an amount of informed opinion in education at the moment suggests that intelligence tests have to be viewed with a great deal of

caution. However, I think it's often given lip service, so that if we happen to reiterate the point here, that's not a bad thing.

* *This was reading achievement though, which should be different.*

* *Yes, but basically an intelligence test is an achievement test too.*

* *I think there's a general observation I can make about most psychologists who have worked with language--some, not all. They tend to use a single Standard for language, then they say of somebody who isn't performing according to the Standard, he has a deficit. They don't appreciate the linguistic position, namely that it's different but not necessarily bad.*

* *Given the fact that psychologists should be a little bit sensitive to reinforcement theory, if they put a value judgement on any particular kind of performance then inevitably they're going to affect subsequent responses in the situation they find themselves. O.K., we've said it again.*

** *I think the message to be taken out of this discussion is that sometimes, perhaps often, psychologists' theoretical bases in linguistics are inadequate.*

* *How about Bernstein?*

** *Yes.*

* *I think part of the problem here is more the kind of negative effect that some of the implications that are drawn from his study can have for the teacher than his actual results themselves. Not having examined the situation myself, I wouldn't be at all surprised if you did spend say, six months sitting around in a pub recording people, that you would find that most of the conversations take place in very restricted set of syntactic forms. There's a pretty strong case for that kind of thing but to then carry it over to the extent that has been done (by others), so that the ghetto kid, Puerto Rican, or white or Negro (especially Negro), is seen as non-verbal has just no real justification.*

* *His position doesn't at all prove that the grammars aren't equivalent in the sense of not having an equal number of complex structures. It doesn't first of all prove that the repertoire of one community is less in some way. All it does is show that in certain social situations there is evidently less creativity on the part of some speakers*

than others.

***	Did he sample different social situations?*

**	No, that's one of the problems.*

***	Did he make a comparative study for middle-class and 'upper' class?*

**	Yes, that he did. But not in pubs. If I remember correctly, it was with school age kids. He went into the homes and worked with lower and middle-class kids and their parents. He may also have gone into sort of a pre-school kindergarten, first grade situation, if I remember correctly, where teachers and kids were.....*

His notion of code is kind of strange from a linguistic viewpoint. For instance he ends up talking about pauses and hesitations and he doesn't ever really establish that people who have a restricted code, so-called, don't also have an elaborated code in another context. Nor does he ever acknowledge that indeed we would have to describe with two different grammars what these two different sets of people do.

**	His notion of 'restricted' and 'elaborated' code is not a language code. I think he's talking about language behavior utilizing the term code in relationship to it. We have to start decoding his language before we can understand what he is doing.*

***	Is he saying that one group uses fewer words and fewer structures.*

**	Well, this is one of the major points I think, and one of the major weaknesses in that he is talking about frequency of occurrences of structures rather than of occurrences of structures.*

**	He thinks he's talking about occurrences of structures--do they exist or do they not exist.*

**	Yes actually, but he doesn't ever prove that point. All he ever does is talk about how they don't seem to be so creative--that is you can predict what they are going to say. In the bar the American equivalent would be: "It sure is nice to get away from it all, isn't it?" ..... "Yeah, you know my old lady just always nagging me to death", and so on. You can probably reconstruct that conversation five million times in a bar. And what he is saying is true in regard to that. But that doesn't mean that in another social situation involving interaction with other people in another kind of problem solving situation it couldn't be much more elaborate.*

**	Now supposing he has correctly analyzed some sort of deprivation* here, in that there is some sort of reduction of competence or reduction of range of syntactic structures or something to that sort, what.....

* He hasn't claimed that.

* Suppose he has. What does he attribute it to?

* Well, he relates it to the social structure right away. He says ..... in lower social class, you're going to have lower numbers.....

* ..... the father will control you more by the predictability of the situation rather than attempt to rationalise reasons for your doing things. You do things because he says so and not because he starts giving you reasons--which somehow might be flexible. That is, you can argue him out of it.

* ..... there is less emphasis toward abstract verbalization.

* ..... the situation provides much of the information. You get almost situational empathy--what the speech people used to call a kind of communion. And language isn't used really to convey information per se in this restricted code.

* So he's claiming that this is a fact about their use of language rather than a consequence of the situation they are in. Right?

* That they're correlated.

* I don't mean their background, I mean where the interview takes place, etc.

* ..... the context of the communication.

* Well, I think he rates it as a result of their background, because this is the kind of context they function in all the time. They have never really developed the sort of elaborated verbal structures that we are forming around here.

* The implication is that they can't. They have a restricted code and they can't go outside the use of it.

* And for this we don't really have contrary evidence.

* No. We don't have proof either.

* It should be easier to prove that it's wrong than to prove that it's right. And I don't think we can even do that on the basis of any evidence we can cite. I think that all of us would agree intuitively that there's something wrong with his hypothesis.

* John Guilfords is taken quite positively. I've been trying to figure out why. There must be something there.

* Ivers doesn't criticize him when he writes about him, he says that it's something that is. It's interesting that people haven't criticized him.

** It is tacitly accepted generally, isn't it, that lower class cultures are usually less verbalized?

* But you find Negroes who can rap--by the dozens.

* Less verbal in which context, do you say? You go to a bus station, who is doing the talking? Black or white? Take a hospital waiting room, emergency room, see groups of whites and Blacks, who's doing the talking. Not the whites. I'm always impressed by this. I mean you see on a bus who's talking? The Black people!

** ..... in an English railway train, who's talking? Good point! Certainly not the middle-class man, he sits there and reads his newspaper.

* I don't know where we got this notion of non-verbalness.....

* (Of course, reading the newspapers is a highly verbal kind of activity--as one notion of verbal--where you use language effectively and so on). What is meant by verbal?

* Well, it just means you get to talk a lot.

** I've assumed that that's what it meant.

* I'm not sure. Verbal and non-verbal is not a linguistic term, it's an educational term. I don't know what they mean by it. I would mean by it that a group is relatively verbal when they use language fluently and easily, which includes reading newspapers.

* I don't think they include that in that term.

* Do they mean they talk a lot?

* Yes.

* I think that's what that means unless I've been mistaken.

* For example, they'll listen to a bunch of Negroes playing. They'll be doing a lot of screaming and carrying on, but not actually uttering sentences. They're communicating but not using.....

* That's non-verbal?

* That's non-verbal.

* Yeah, that sounds like the Detroit principal who told me that all the kids do is holler. All the time Black kids in school are shouting. So I said, "Take me, I want to hear them holler". "Right out here in the lobby", he said. So the kid was saying "man-whatcha!-wanna-do-that-for"

about that tone. He wasn't hollering; it was a different intonation contour which the Principal read as hollering.

* Teachers in Texas schools who have taught both Negro and white, sometimes say, "Well, Negro kids go out and make a lot of noise, but they don't talk, they're not talking to one another. The white kids are talking to one another."

** It's testable. Judging by the behavior of my kids (who aren't Negroes) this applies to all kids.

* It's incredible how rapidly these sterotypes can get transmitted.

** There does seem a certain amount of validity to the idea that the lower socio-economic group don't have access to the same amount of printed verbiage---newspapers.

* What they read is less complex.

* But they are presumed to watch TV considerably more.

* Watching TV considerably more does not mean that you're not exposed to a fairly high level..... For example, if you watch Channel 2 news at 11:00 or 6:00 you'll hear Severeid or some of these other old time newscasters who use pretty elaborate language. Severeid is not talking in monosyllables and simplex sentences by any means. In fact his ordinary newscast is as complicated as anything that has been said here today in terms of the linguistic structure of his message--right? So the fact that they are watching television doesn't mean that they're exposed to simple stuff like cartoons.

* I thought I was making the case the other way.

* I misunderstood you. O.K., fine. You're making the case the other way, I'm agreeing with you.

* The point is whether they read newspapers or not they're exposed to a wide variety of fairly complex language.

** O.K., now here's the problem. It's normally assumed by teachers that children need a certain language repertoire in order to go on to the next stage--for example, their proficiency in mathematics depends on certain language facility. Now, can I take out of this discussion that some of the kinds of experiences that would be useful in an advanced stage of education are denied to disadvantaged youngsters--are not available to the disadvantaged youngsters.

* I don't understand what you mean.

* I think I understand what you mean, but I don't think we are likely to know the answer to it. I understood you to say that higher, relatively higher (I don't mean university education, but relatively) higher levels of education in mathematics, social sciences, history, whatever fields you want, depends on a prior acquisition of sufficient sophistication in the use of natural language to be able to deal with relatively abstract concepts in these other fields.

** Yes.

* If it is the case that if they're not brought up to what are conceived to be the normal Standards, in the Standard language, then they're going to be disadvantaged in respect to these other subjects when they get there.

** Yes.

* I don't see how we can have any contribution to make if that is the question.

** This is a presumption that mainly teachers of disadvantaged kids are living under--that if they don't get it (language) now, they are going to be handicapped later on.

* It is based on the fact that the teacher is going to be talking to them in Standard English, or is it something about abstract reasoning not being possible for them because they don't speak the Standard language? What's bothering them there? It's unquestionably correct that if they are not receiving on the wave length of the transmission, they're going to be in trouble all right. But is the trouble simply because they're not operating comfortably with the Standard language?

* I know of people who go clear through their college undergraduate experience and only as a senior do they begin to flex themselves with regard to language usage.

* What are they using, passives or something?

* Well that, or complex or compound, compound-complex sentences....

* Compound sentences are extremely common from the age of three.

* But I don't think compound-complex are.

* As your use of the language becomes more sophisticated you get much more novelisation. That is the direction of learned prose. It's the direction of sociological jargon.

* Which then we try to get rid of?

* *Which we then later try to get rid of, yes. If you're going to write in a decent style you have to get rid of all that novelization, that you finally acquired in the process of becoming sophisticated.*

* *Novelization--that's a lower-class phenomenon--the upper-middle-class wants to get rid of it.*

* *That's right. That's exactly correct. The guys that we call literary geniuses are the guys who didn't go through that intermediate stage. So they've got an extra twenty years of practice in using the language the way it ought to be.*

* *You see, I think these young people aren't to be written off if they haven't acquired language facility at some given point in time.....*

** *O.K. The point is well taken. I think the anxiety crystallizes itself around the question of learning to read. The assumption is that if kids don't learn to read quickly, then in fact they're going to be handicapped because at subsequent levels the teacher will refer them back: "Go and read this, go and read that", and if they can't read adequately, or if they are sufficiently negatively oriented towards reading, then the cause is lost at that particular point. Which leads us into the second point--the implications of teaching English as a second language.*

* *The current idea is that beginning reading should be in the tribal dialect, so that the child will not have two major problems, the reading problem on the one hand and becoming familiar with the second dialect on the other.*

** *Question however, how do you write this other dialect?*

* *Well, I'll be happy to respond to what I think is currently Stewart and Baratz's position on this. They just got a grant from NIMH to do this very thing. They have set up a special shop in Washington called the Education Study Center, in which they are doing it--presumably. And in "Teaching Black Children to Read", a current publication of the Center for Applied Linguistics, Stewart has a pretty good description of what they're trying to do, and Baratz does also. Anyway, their feeling is that there is no need to rewrite anything in phoney spelling--unless for example, it's normal for kids to drop the first prefix in a word like 'remember' and say it only as 'member'. In this case it's spelled 'member'. In other words, for that kind of*

thing, whole morpheme mutilation, they would want to write that way. But they would not simply spell 'first' f-i-r-s or something like that. Their feeling is that the unpredictability of the oral language to the printed page is so great to the Non-Standard speaker, that they're going to have to construct in normal Standard orthography beginning reading materials which reflect their oral language. That is, it will use a regular spelling system--with the exception that I mentioned. So that "he be happy" all the time was written that way rather than in pseudo. A novel form would only be used where the oral language of a kid has something that is not in the printed language as it used to be, or where the oral language does not have something that the printed page does have, or where there is some drastic syntax revision (for example, if a kid always uses multiple negation).

** *They will not be influenced by phonology then?*

* *No..... or sentences like "I don't know, can he go".*

* *Yes. "I don't know, can he go". That's right, rather than "if he would go" or something like that. That's their assumption.*

Of course, the interesting problem is that you can study how people who learn to read, don't learn to read well. (Because you can study their reading errors and reconstruct their problems on the way). But kids who don't learn to read at all, you can't study how it is that they don't learn to read at all. Baratz and Stewart feel it takes a drastic experiment like this--where they are operating with a group of children who predictably (on the basis of what we know of the education system in Washington) might not learn to read at all. They want to try it with them and see if they learn to read better than somebody who doesn't have these aids.

* *So this is experimental?*

* *Right.*

* *I don't think you should assume for a second that this represents the view of linguists generally. The procedure where you later shift over to Standard English, may not be the right one to start with at all. I think one can advance some pretty strong arguments against this position--such as the fact that the speaker of something resembling middle-class Standard English (namely the six or seven year old child), when he starts to read, has to learn to read something which is so*

incredibly far from his normal speech--in terms of phonetic representation and phonetic reality and even, for that matter, generally syntactic reality--that you're already involved in this huge translation problem and probably a little more just isn't going to make that much difference.

*   Barratz and Stewart will say that middle-class children also ought to have the language closer to his perspective.

*   All right, but that's not usually assumed.

*   As I said earlier today, I think much of this stuff is being talked about with respect to the disadvantaged child could also apply right straight across the board.

*   Now, that may very well be the case. But I am not convinced that that is the right way to go. However, I think that that is worth experimenting with. I think it's definitely well worth the experiment.

**   For years there has been an educational statement of faith, namely you start with the known and go to the unknown. And it seems to me that Stewart's position is sensitive--to that philosophy.

*   ..... if it were all that clear exactly what to make of the internalized knowledge the child has, at that point I would have agreed but I don't think it is that obvious.....

*   Let me read a couple of sentences that I found in some recent beginning reading texts--they are along this line. These are not geared to the disadvantaged but I think they show the mismatch of the oral language to the written language: "He is sad, that he acted as he did", which is something I would not hear children say. "I had a hat, I did".

*   Sounds like a British Sailor.....

**   Gilbert & Sullivan.....

*   That's right. "Sam hands a man the map". "Sam hands the man a map" is the way I want to read that, where it really is, "Sam hands a man the map". I don't know why I want to reverse those but I get the same feeling from lots of other people who have read it too. Here's a neat one which may sound familiar: "The pen is on the thin, tan, mat, and the cap is thin and the pig is fat". That is clearly a case where linguistic theory got in the way of teaching reading.

**   Clearly. It does.....

*   To continue: "Jerry swung his bat". Next sentence: "Over the fence went the ball".

* Oh, No!

* ..... an observation on the structure of English--it's only in beginning reading texts that you find that kind of sentence.

* ..... kids don't begin sentences with prepositional phrases followed by predicate.

* In 250,000 words of recorded telephone conversation I didn't find that sort of thing at all.

* ..... and of course what the kid does is read those sentences this way, "Jerry swung his bat over the fence". Then he stops and realizes something went wrong. The teacher says, "He doesn't know a capital letter when he sees one".

And one last one which I want to read because it's a neat one. There's a page with a kitten on it which has, at the top, "round is a kitten". On the next page with a picture of a ball, "round is a ball". I've been passing that around to my staff. Nine out of ten of them misread it as "round as a kitten", and"round as a ball". Maybe beginning reading kids who are focussing on letter sound relationships will see the 'is' but I think that supports the predictability thesis. Metaphor is not predictable. Kids who misread that may be trapped by the.....

* No one is going to argue that you've got to have natural English as a starting point for reading.

* Well, Stewart and Baratz just extend that point to ask; natural language in what dialect?

* Yeah, but that's equally difficult. I mean is there a Black dialect or is there a Black English that Stewart can write in?

* The problem of homogeneity is always going to come up. I mean, a little while ago you would not let me talk about 'Standard versus Non-Standard". At first you didn't like the 'versus'. And then you didn't like the singular on those two. You wanted them both plural.

* I would say that there is a Non-Standard language and we should write a grammar for it. We can, as a matter of fact, if we are really adopting the approach that linguists have been talking about for a long time. The language can be described in its own right. So I find a Black speaker and I describe his language. We get a grammar and I can go around testing......

* It's an abstraction though when you've written it, right?

Sure, so is Standard.

I don't think Standard English syntax is an abstraction of the same type because I think it's shared by everybody in this room who grew up all over the country. Phonology, yes, there's no Standard there--there are many Standards in pronunciation. Syntax in American English--I don't believe there's no Standard.

For a substantial community of Blacks I think it's quite homogeneous.

Splendid. All right, I think it's homogeneous for the whites too. White English has a nice Standard syntax. I think I'm correct to talk about Standard English with respect to syntax. I challenge you in fact to show me.

With the Black you mean?

For white.

Oh, O.K.

Now, if the same situation is true for Black, O.K. But you all did challenge that earlier. You said 'Standards'.

I was merely trying to say that we should talk about a continuum. And as far as I'm concerned, on one end we've got the grammar for Standard, at the other end we've got the grammar for Black.

Is it the case that there's something as homogeneous for Blacks, as white Standard is for whites? Is that the case? Because if it is then I've got to agree with you.

I would argue that it is.

I don't think so. Not in Texas. I couldn't generalize over Negro speech in Texas.

If I sit down and start working with the data that I get from Black informants, or more precisely one or two, I think I could write a grammar. And if I write a grammar for that set of data, the same way I would write a grammar for other whites, even if I use myself introspecting with my own language, I have a grammar. The problem is that nobody has yet sat down and tried it. That is, I'm saying it is tryable and that when we end up having tried it, we'll find that we have two different rule sets. That's what I claim.

I tend to say that you're going to have to write some kind of extremely complicated variable rule like Labov is postulating.

* Look, we've got hours of recorded stuff from Negroes in Texas--elderly people who have second grade education, this kind of stuff--without the appearance of 'be' in the whole discourse.

* It's not Black English then.

** What?!

* You can't lose with that line of argument.

* What the hell is it they speak then?

* Well, I don't know. Somebody else is going to have to go out and describe that.

* I have met the distinction between "Black English" and "Mainstream Black English".

* So have I.

* I heard "Non-Standard Black English" recently. So you've got Black American English, and Non-Standard Black American English.

* The Georgetown gal certainly implied that there's a whole range, in that she said we have "our own Standard, we'll keep that".

* Well, I think that's why, when we deal synchronicly with a group of people in a city like Detroit or Washington, we would have to come up with quantitative measures to go with it. And that's the very problem, that's what was wrong with the Atlas methodology in such things. You've got one utterance, or several isolated utterances from which you have to formulate something, and it's why it's led us to these.....

* Yeah, but you see, you have to keep going and going and going. You can always find variation. For example, Labov's work in the Lower East Side; he left out first generation Korean immigrants because he only wanted to describe the language from a certain position.

* But those Negroes who grew up in Texas had been there all their lives?

* Oh, that's all right. I don't..... I never have claimed that all Blacks speak Black American English. Nobody would.

* I thought you were claiming there was definable entity that we should call Black American English. This Black Standard English, could be contrasted at the opposite pole from something that I want to call, for the moment, white upper-middle-class Standard English.

* Educated American English?

* ..... educated Amrican English, which I think everybody in this

room shares, and which I claim is syntacticly extremely homogeneous--and morphologically.

* And which would be shared by most leaders of the Black community too.

* ..... by most of the leaders of the Black community. I think that's correct.

** In order to substantiate your point of view, all you've got to do is accumulate a big enough n.--a large enough population which reflects the grammar that you can identify from your one informant. Right?

* I am not too sure what relevance the n. has. I would agree with you that that seems to be the thing that is going to convince....

** Otherwise it's idiosyncratic.

* But there is no point in the procedure that Baratz and Stewart are using unless there is a sizeable community.

* That's right. Exactly.

* That's a necessary condition, not a sufficient condition but an absolutely necessary condition for the experiment to be even worth running.

** O.K., no let's get back to my problem. There are two points that come out of this. If in fact you've got a series of community identifiable languages, then Stewart's solution is only going to be germane for one particular segment of the total population. Now, question. Is it possible to generalize on the basis of Stewart's approach so that teachers can be prepared for a variety of situations rather than specifically for the situation that Stewart has in mind?

* I would claim the teachers need to be prepared. They have to be. Schools and school district have to have the linguistics resources at their command to make it possible for them to track the language development of particular students as well as groups of students.

** How? What would they have to do? What are the resources?

* Well, you're going to have to have available linguists who are aware that there's quite a bit of relativity here, and be able to come up with some kind of (at least) sketchy, structural description for each child, and then you also have to have some idea of the target forms that you're after.

** You're talking of the best of all possible worlds. At the moment do you envisage a sort of traveling linguist who would go around and do linguistic diagnosis.

* Yes. Anyway you want to do it.

* What you need to do is hire 1,000 linguists, right off the bat.

* It would be nice if we could devise some sort of diagnostic test and give the teacher enough expertise to be able to do something about it once they have relevant information.

* Not a single diagnostic test though, that's where all the problems are.

* Well, I don't know how it could be done.

* With young kids; this is one of the points I made at the Georgetown round-table. You can often do it with these imitation tests. They're easily administered and they pick up a lot of points.

** Is there a technique that teachers might use for having their children being informants?

* Sure.

* That's what they should be taught to do.

** O.K.

* So that makes the teacher a learner, and we're back to that hang-up earlier about the teacher's authority versus the teacher who doesn't know something.

** But if she's the authority on how to learn then she's all right still.

* That's a nice point. Very nice point, from the point of view of the linguists, since we claim to know remarkably little about the nature of our subject and the language.

* So we teach how to deal with it.

* Yeah, and so the most we can hope to do is to get the teacher to the point where she doesn't act as though she knew things that she can't possible really know. Therefore she's got to act like a learner. She's got to know where the problems are.

* That's one of the big things I think that's turned kids off in school. The teacher in authoritarian manner has said, "Look this is the way it is", when they know it isn't. My son after the teacher tells him about long a's and short a's goes out of the classroom and to me says, "Daddy, how about this?" And he gives me a list of words that

are counter examples. And I say, "Well, you don't tell the teacher that, that would upset her too much". But there's no respect for the teacher after this because the teacher hasn't accounted for all the exceptions that he can bring up himself.

* Yeah, but would he be willing to raise those..... I think you gave him the wrong advice. I think you should have told him to go back and raise those exceptions with the teacher.

* Not this teacher.

* Oh, you know the teacher?

* Yes.

* Well, what we want is a situation where in fact she will encourage those.

* Exactly. that's the point. This one would have made him go stand in the hall.

* That requires security which she doesn't have, obviously.

* This is the kind of linguistic training you want to give teachers.

** O.K. Agreed. No arguments so far. Now, to do this, is it terribly complicated?

* No, I shouldn't think so.

** You don't have to become a fully fledged linguist in order.....?

* Now we're back to my point about manipulating abstract entities.

* How does this get us back to that point? You really lost me on that transition.

* Sorry.

* That's what's called an 'inductive leap'!

** I think it was called a 'generation gap'!

* That's too much.

* We're deteriorating fast.

* I don't know that teaching the teacher to do that sort of thing is the rôle of the linguist. It seems to me that that's an attitude towards life, an attitude toward teaching that ought to be derived from whatever they do in introductory education courses.

* That's true, but now there is a very specifically linguistic problem here. Namely that we have educated into our society (after all the teachers grew up in this society too), a great deal of linguistic insecurity because of the way our school system operates. And at some

point the teachers achieved what they consider security--it is in fact false security--by learning what is 'right'. This is really deep in their blood, and I think only some sort of linguistic sophistication is going to make them react, reasonably and rationally to this problem. Whereas I think it's true that educationists generally..... could teach them that we don't know answers and we should be open-minded about all kinds of questions, for example, with respect to mathematics or social sciences or history or anything like that. That I think you can teach in the education schools. But I think you've really got to have someone who is halfway sophisticated about language to get this linguistic notion to them. I mean for language this really--this is a shockingly irrational thing that they've got to be taught--from the point of the mythology that they've grown up with.

* I'd like to support that. I've known elementary teachers and prospective elementary teachers in my classroom who are creative and ingenious, and who can raise questions and get their youngsters to raise questions and develop curiosity. But on this one matter--language--it's dead blank. It's closed.

* Things are, as they are, as they are, as they are.

* Really, and we brought them up this way. In the whole society, we've got a very deep and formidable mythology, with respect to language--everybody shares it--it's monstrous. And it takes a lot of breaking down. You're quite right. I don't even know how you succeed in breaking it. You said you succeeded with your thirty students this year. Now, I'll have to say honestly, I've taught a lot of linguistics classes, elementary linguistics classes and I figure I don't get through, on this point. Really through.

* Let me put that realistically--we had some success.

* We had some success last summer with a tremendously intensive workshop we had in Tyler. When we got through that, some of the teachers told me: "I wish I had last year to teach over again, I can see all the things I did wrong. I'll never tell thse kids not to do this", and so forth. And they're really horrified to see what they've done. I think they're changed people.

* I sense that reaction too, but I think the proof is in going out and looking and seeing if they really do. I know what they can tell

you at the end of a term.

* We followed up.

* You followed up?

* We revolutionized one whole East Texas community.

* I know I've gotten through to some in the last thirty-five years, because I've seen the results.

* Well, I've gotten to a few, but I mean the percentages?

* The important component of this thing was--and I think this is not straight linguistics--cultural sensitivity training.

** I think one point we might take in parentheses is that the utilization of language cues is a fair way to determine status relationships too. It's a very convenient stereotyping device.

* Well, they do that. You don't have to teach them how to do that.

* Part of our ritual is that we have an idea of what is proper language.

* We certainly do have such an idea.

* Let me bring up one thing that hasn't been mentioned at all. This has been an extremely sore point everytime, everyplace I have gone where the question of teaching Standard English as a second dialect has been brought up. And that is the belief, or rather the interpretation on the part of American Negroes (but also others as well), that what was involved in this, was the old speech pathology kind of thing. It wasn't just a matter of teaching them the use of certain syntactic forms and certain morphological forms, this kind of thing, but also reformation of the entire phonology. This interpretation will often be placed on it and it is seen as a threat. This is, I think, where most of the negative reaction comes from--you know, when that gal jumped up and said "you're trying to teach us the white man's way of talking", this sort of thing. I think that 90% of negative reaction comes from imagined threat at the phonological level. As soon as you reassure these people that phonology is O.K., and that all we're interested in is the syntax and morphology, they're completely relieved.

* That point was made tangentially and accidently earlier when I pointed out that there is no Standard English phonology. There's a Standard English morphology syntax.

* But somehow or another, nothing threatens them more than this

imagined attack on syntactical phonology.

* I think you're right. That's a very nice point.

* Of course as soon as this gets into the hands of the speech pathology people, it does become that. We had a horrible illustration in Texas. We had a project and one community got left out. It wanted in on it but we couldn't afford to include them--we didn't have the funds. So they went to another University, to the speech department there. One of their people came over, used our project design but completely misinterpreted it. He rounded up all the Negro teachers in this one town and went through a six week program on pronunciation. They analyzed, they recorded, they re-analyzed what some of the phonological features were. They noted that the most recurrent feature of all was the omission of 'post-vocalic r', so this was the feature they worked on for six weeks.

* Oh, my god!

* At the end of six weeks of training all but two of the teachers were able to successfully produce 'post-vocalic r' on cue.

* With salivation?

* That is so distressing.

* And this is the kind of thing that can be unleashed when you start getting into this.

* That's why we've got to get linguists into the school system instead of speech people. Speech people are just fantastically efficient in their P.R., so they're everywhere. Some of them are quite enlightened, but the bulk of them worry about these elements in a list and making sure somebody has acquired that element.

* Well, there is one National Speech and Hearing Survey that is a case in point. They're actually going around the country (at a cost of millions of dollars in vans, sound equipment, traveling etc.) showing kids pictures of a chicken and saying for example. "What is this?" The kids say "Chicken", so they check off 'ch', 'k', and 'un'. Then they go to the next word. One of the people involved dropped by our place. He thought that while he was getting this kind of articulation and hearing information he would also get some language data. He wondered what he should do?

* You mean they were checking off that they could pronounce those

consonants or something?

*   *Nothing to do with environment, nothing to do with context, nothing to do with style, nothing to do with syntax.*

*   *It's fantastic. They had money for this sort of thing?*

*   *I couldn't believe it either.*

**   *Let me raise this one please. And I'll have to reflect cultural bias by doing it. It is tacitly accepted that in New Zealand there is a correct pronunciation. And by and large, because of the homogeneity of the population, it's reflected in the teaching of the schools.*

*   *Now there's a different reason in fact. I'll give it to you historically if you want it. It relates to your relationship to England. You have a received pronunciation, and that is what got transmitted to New Zealand. It's the same tradition. It's a totally different tradition from the one we have in this country. Accent is crucial to Standard English, English.*

*   *And in some abstract sense upheld in the upper classes.*

**   *That explains it, but it doesn't altogether eliminate one of the consequences, and that is that it is relatively easy for New Zealanders to talk to each other. Now I think one of the things that we've already discussed is the fact that it is sometimes difficult for Americans to talk to each other. It's possibly a phonological problem. Now to what extent do you want to perpetuate the prospects of difference, and maybe enhance the continuation of difference?*

*   *First of all I don't accept as a notion that it is difficult ever for speakers of what he is now labelling, correctly I think, educated American English, to talk to each other.*

**   *Yes, but you're only talking about a limited population.*

*   *I have never had any trouble understanding any geographically distributed variant of American English (assuming Standard syntax and so on). There are some Negro dialects and some white sub-standard dialects, where I would be in deep trouble in a hurry, but this is the difference between Standard and Non-Standard. It's not a difference between pronunciations.*

**   *O.K., but the people you're reassuring about phonology are your nearly educated American teachers whose phonology is not too different from the educated American phonology.*

* But there is no single educated American phonology. If we had McDavid here, you would hear phonology from where, the coastal, or Piedmont, South Carolina, something of that sort. If we had Leon Howard from my department, you would hear Tidewater, Louisiana phonology and so on.

** Well, back to the problem of the teacher. She is confronted with kids who have a non-educated phonology. Now they presumably are going to be threatened because they are going to be told "you've got to change pronunciation patterns". Isn't that right?

* No, but I think one of the points that is worth making is that the phonology, by and large, with minor details, will not have to be changed. What has to be changed is syntax and morphology. Right?

* "Trow de ball" or something like that.

* Yeah, a few things like that.

* There is a continuum. There are educated Negro speakers in Texas and around the country who have eliminated from their speech a great deal of the assimilative reduction. That is the big gap here. In other wrods, they've got final consonant clusters and this sort of thing.

* Yeah, where but not always where they're spelled because none of us have them where we ought to have them.

** But principally because they've been educated to do so. I mean, they're being subjected to intense pressure. Now one of the implications taken over from the discussion here is that we will reduce this pressure--you know the absolute standard has got to be forgotten. Now, are you telling me that any pronunciation goes and are you assuming that if any pronunciation goes, suddenly everyone is going to learn how to understand everyone else's pronunciation.

* We're suggesting a hierarchy of importance here. Grammatical features (unless I misunderstand it too) tend to count most sociologically --they're way up here. And then phonological matters are down here. Maybe some of the phonological matters creep into the territory of grammar but not very many-- like "trow the ball' or something like that can reach rather high; but "pin, pen","wich, which", and all that stuff is generally not terribly important.

* There are a whole mess of regional Standards with respect to pronunciation. With respect to syntaxes, clear across the country there

is only one Standard.

* Things like move the mouff" and that sort of thing. That's pretty much of a shibboleth.

* That's one, as a matter of fact, that you won't even notice unless you're awfully careful. "Mouff, mouff" will go right by. My wife is a "mouff" speaker. Nobody has ever caught her at it but me. And every time she says it I know that other people never notice it because they don't expect her to be. She's obviously Standard, obviously educated and so on--but "mouff" nevertheless.

** Well, I'm sorry to persist with the point. It's probably not a terribly bright question, but at the moment we can distinguish between the phonology of educated Americans and the phonology of non-educated Americans. Now question: Is that.....

* That's the leap you made. You see, in New Zealand the population is small enough that you don't have to take into account Southern New Zealand, as we would in the United States, given the South. So we're talking about flexibility and tolerance with regard to sound systems. But relatively less flexibility with regard to syntactic structure. That's the point, isn't it?

** But if there are varieties of sound systems, how do you make speakers of one sound system sensitive to another sound system--this is the third issue that we had to get on to, wasn't it?

* How do you make speakers of one sound system sensitive to another sound system? One very important thing is that the teachers be exposed to the language of the kids that they are supposed to be teaching. I've seen this happen over and over again, especially where a white teacher in a ghetto situation has the kids for five years and he never really hears them talk other than in single responses. We talked about a language lab earlier and I think maybe the teacher ought to be the one to go into the language lab. Perhaps as much as any student should.

* Would you go so far as to say that it would be desirable? It's been done in one place at least, and also two or three places for example in English as a second language program in UCLA I think, where the shock value, so-called, is obtained by having the teacher learn, in this case, the Black dialect.

* Well, I think you've got a psychological problem there that's

greater than the problem of learning a foreign language.

* I think the difficulty involved in ever getting there would probably overcome the reason for doing it. I think receptive knowledge of it would be..... I'd settle for that frankly, if we could get that much.

* You brought up the problem of cultural sensitization earlier.

* Yes.

* I think that this a very great problem because the natural tendencies would be to be egocentric.

* Ethnocentric.

* It's the same thing--cultural versul individual.

* That's it. Anyway this notion of a language related de-ethnocentration--de-ethnocentracisation.....

* You can do better than that!

* Yeah, but you know what we mean, we'll construct a label for it later.

* Let me give an example that's a little bit outside of this. One of the things we ran into in a survey on a Navajo reservation was the culture conflict that went on in the classroom. The Navajo kids had been taught at home that it is polite to be quiet. When one speaks to an elder, one speaks in a soft voice. However, in class when the teacher would have them respond, the children would speak softly and the teacher would say; "speak up, speak up, I can't hear you". So she was encouraging them to engage in a behavior which they had learned at home as disrespectful.

* Yes.

* Eye contact is another example.

* The eye aversion is something with the Negro kid.

* The Negro child who doesn't want to look the teacher in the eye out of humbleness is sometimes accused of not paying attention.

* Or of being shifty-eyed and untrustworthy and that sort of thing.

* Well, this would seem to be an area to be pushed for quite a bit of mileage, by using what we were talking about earlier--getting the teacher to help the kids play games with the language. But to get her at the point of doing that, she's going to have to be pretty 'de-ethnocentricised'. I think these things go hand in hand. And I

think that this would, in a way, answer the question, how are you going to make people in the North aware of the problem too. For example, a teacher in Chicago middle-class area gets an Ozark family into the neighborhood. Some of the kids come to class. How are you going to make her sensitive to the fact that just because the strangers are saying it another way, it doesn't mean it's not functionally equivalent to what she's saying.

* *This is obviously an over-simplification, but in 1965 on that task force for the disadvantaged, one of my recommendations along with Marjorie Smiley (the two of us worked together on this) was that we suggested very strongly that a cultural anthropology course needed to be a requirement for elementary education majors on the basis of the sort of a violation of this thing we had seen. I don't think a course in anything is ever an answer, but it's a step in the direction.*

** *It depends, if it's a conventional course that virtually is a series of programmed behaviors required to meet a particular evaluative criterion so that they can get the grade of A or B.....*

* *But of course, the anthropology course is a kind of 'far away peoples and places'. It's sort of like Bolinger said in that recent book of his, which I think was so beautiful--the foreigner, the heathen who hasn't heard* ***the*** *word would be given a certain latitude, but those in our midst who have heard the truth and objected, give him no quarter whatsoever.*

* *Sounds more like St Paul!*

* *When the Negro child behaves differently.....(Bolinger was giving it in the language area, but this is true in culture too)..... when he doesn't behave like the white child, he gets blamed for it you see. He is not doing the right thing.*

* *Evil stereo-types are always attached to it when people are very close. You disregard those over there and in Central Australia.*

** *For some reason or other I'm allowed a certain amount of latitude here, maybe because of my accent or because of my particular lexicon. Now, I wonder why this attitude can't generalize to other cultural groups. Maybe it can.....*

* *Your language happens to be obviously recognizable as so-called high status language. That makes all the difference. Everybody knows*

that the way you talk is approximately the way famous men like Winston Churchill talked.

** So really your message is a message of tolerance--but related also to language.

* Yes, and this simply goes both directions. Everybody can tolerate your kind of accent--except a few Anglophobes.

* It is the same when a person comes up from Mexico and doesn't speak English too well. That's all right. He hasn't had much chance to hear much English and so forth. We can accept that. But the Spanish speaking kid in our own back yard who doesn't speak good English, that's because he is ignorant and stupid, incapable of learning and so forth.

* There's range of attitudes toward different accents.

** O.K. Can I ask another question that came up earlier too, namely the distinction between verbal language and written language. It's very obvious that the way people talk is different from the way they conventionally write. And I wonder to what extent the focus for underprivileged children should be on talk language as distinct from written language, writing language. See Stewart is going to run into the problem that he's got no Negro literature that he can use for back up.

* He's writing his own material. He won't take a Standard beginning reading text and begin to rewrite into Non-Standard. He will start from scratch.

** As far as the teacher is concerned, it's a question of getting some sort of way to crystallize spoken language and made a judgement about spoken language, and also develop written language. Now, one of the thoughts that has crossed my mind is that perhaps an implication that should be taken out of your argument, is that the teacher might be advised to distinguish between verbal language and written language.

* Now wait a minute. At what age does she have to start dealing with written language--that is, other than reading it, which is not the same as producing it. You don't start teaching them anything about the differences between spoken and written English until they have to start writing seriously themselves--which is someplace close to High School.

** Oh, no.

* Junior High.

** No.

* I am not talking about hand-writing, about independent composition.

** Writing down their ideas?

* Writing down their ideas in intelligible ways.

** Certainly Grade III, if not younger.

* Second or third grade. My son wrote a little story recently on Tyrranasaurus Rex.

* It wasn't judged as written English by the canons of written English?

* Well.....she was after punctuation.

* Well, spelling and punctuation maybe--at this point here, you're still not beginning to worry about those things which clearly differentiate written English.

* Sentence variety, something like that?

* Yeah, sentence variety, non-repetition of word meaning, use of synonyms instead of repeating the same noun over and over, avoiding long series of conjoined sentences, putting periods instead of and's, and making transitions between sentences. All those things you don't start worrying about at the level we're talking about, do you?

** Yes, in fact they do. They start worrying about sentence structure early. Now, it's fairly obvious from the studies that.....

* Worrying about sentences?

** Teachers think people talk in sentences--they just don't--not always.....

* All right, conceded. I see what you're saying. We're just seeing in two different ways.

** Oh, I'm sorry.

* It's O.K.

** I mean ye olde worlde type of sentence.

* Yeah.

** O.K.

* O.K.

** Now we've just said "Yeah", "O.K.", "O.K.", now those weren't sentences.

* That's why I said there's going to be trouble if we--yeah.

* We are agreeing. Let's go on from that. We don't talk in sentences. This is clearly correct in the sense that you mean.

** Thank you. I think I understand what a concession this is..... I know that if you reconstructed these bits, that they could be reconstructed as sentences.

* I think the kids ought to be allowed to write it that way. That's the first claim I would make. It's wrong to impose the notion that what you write must be complete sentences in this older grammarian sense of complete sentences.

* Experienced teachers agree with that--you're right on that. They let a kid tell a story and they write down what he experienced. An experience chart approach. They write down what he had said, presumably exactly as he says it. So the kid has then 'written' a story. And they show it to him and help him read what he has written. So far it's pretty nice. So far so good. The problem is they edit.

* They, the teachers?

* I don't think they can help themselves though.

* They're taught to edit because we've taught them not to accept 'errors'..... and to put subjects in and make subjects agree with.....

* They erase things and add things to make the norms more approximate.

* Well, I think something that you really ought to seriously consider experimenting with (since that's what you're doing in the long run here, you're experimenting) is precisely this. Someplace you have got to remove from this damn educational program the notion that from the time the kids start putting anything on paper, it has got to conform to the canons of good written English. Personally I don't think that you should start worrying about the canons of good written English much before High School. That's a personal judgement, I may be wrong, but I'm sure that if you start in second and third grade, worrying about those things it's too damn early. At that point you only want to worry about correspondence between things that you can say and how you write them down. That's all that you should be concerned with.

* We're in a vacuum here. We don't really know what goes on in the first and twelfth grades--what they're teaching. And whether or not they're emphasizing this, and when.

* Yeah, I don't know what the facts are, but I certainly know how

I feel about what the facts ought to be.

* If kids say "my brother, he dont got no baseball", then it's all right to write "he don't got no baseball". Right?

* O.K..

** I'm with you.

* If we don't we're back to the thing that Baratz and Stewart talked about; something that is oral language, producing the mismatch between the oral and the written.

* It has often been suggested to give him another version which has been changed after he has produced the first.

* That's part of improving his spoken English.

* You do show him that there is another way of expressing these things, and you teach him to be able to read both ways--the way he wrote it first, and the way it's edited into standardized.

* Fine. We can teach him to read it back. But the point I was trying to get at is, and I think it's absolutely essential, that the differences between spoken English of the most elegant variety you can find, and written English, are recognized as being of enormous magnitude. There's just a tremendous difference between really carefully written English and anybody's spoken English. All right, now those differences, I don't think should be introduced in any form under any disguise at this point in the game. Later, yes. Maybe you do have to reform the whole damn school system, but.....

* No problem.

* I'm not convinced yet. You're saying this but why? I don't see why not? The fourth grade, seventh grade..... I mean, justify for me the cut-off point as high as you want to cut it off.

* All right. I don't want to cut it off, I don't want to start that kind of nonsense until someplace around the beginning of puberty, which is like twelve or thirteen years old, generally.

* Why not wait until they're twenty-one.

* Well, because I don't know of any significant, physiological changes, and neurological changes that are associated with the age of twenty-one. That's an arbitrary voting age, as far as I know. It doesn't have any other meaning, but the ages twelve, thirteen, fourteen have huge neurological changes, huge physiological changes and so on,

which are associated with a kind of a fixing of the linguistic system.

* But you can find people who say that really, really qualitative leaps in stylistic polish take place much later.

* Much later, I wouldn't be surprised, but I don't want to start before that. I didn't want to say you couldn't start later.

* The pupils do get thrown into reading rather complex stuff by the time they get to High School.

* Reading--that's all right, it's receptive. But I'm talking about producing, and thinking of conscientiously modifying their style on the written page.

* But I think they're going to have trouble in handling those things even receptively until they've learned how to write.

** It seems to me that to be consistent with your own argument, you must argue that when it becomes culturally relevant, is the time to introduce it. Now in fact, the school can create the aura of cultural relevancy.....

* Do you think they can?

** I imagine so.

* Right. What can we derive from evidence?

* The evidence from what I read of the Kelly-Hunt stuff, is that the kinds of variety of structures that they would have to have to be able to do anything significant with development of style..... (let's use the word style, literary style, something like that--literary variety) ..... don't develop to any extent until after the ninth grade or so. The Kelly-Hunt stuff shows sort of two year gaps. Gradually by the ninth grade the kids have begun to get, productively, the variety of structures that you need in order to even talk about style. The Kelly-Hunt stuff supports the point of view that I'm espousing here.

* A certain kind of embedding is going to have to be taught, they're not going to acquire that on their own.

* Absolutely, I don't challenge that it has to be taught overtly, and explicitly, But I don't think it should be done too early.

* No. I agree. I don't either.

* I think they've got enormous problems just learning that there is a real close but abstract set of relationships that exists between stuff on a printed page and the noises they make with their mouths. They've

got an awful lot to learn in that area.

* ..... *One of the things that concerns me (this is kind of a kick I'm on) is the feeling that if kids move into reading more complex, written stuff, you know, really formal written English, and they don't already have the structures in their own competence, there's a big gap in reading instruction. They're carried up to this through the word attack approach and from there on they're left on their own.*

* *That's true.*

* ..... *then they hit this complex syntax and I think a big loss occurs there (it is never recognized). One of the ways that it does show up is when you have people read out loud and you find that they just don't read in terms of grammatical structures. They read in terms of words.*

* *How do* ***you*** *read when you read out loud? I've written papers for oral presentation (I don't write out lectures, I can't tell you anything about that)--but the things that I do in fact try to read; like lectures or papers at linguistic societies, invariably I end up discovering that no matter, even if I'm writing it for oral presentation, when I actually end up presenting it, I change words all over the place because then I am really talking. I want it to sound like I'm talking. I don't want to sound as if I'm reading something stilted. I cannot write the way I talk. No matter how hard I try, I can't get it down like that. And I can't read fluently unless I change words in it also. You give me a passage of stuff that was written to be read only to oneself (this is the way most things were written) I cannot read it aloud fluently unless I change some of the words.*

* *I had a girl come in and she told me she was having a lot of trouble keeping up with the reading assignments--she was a senior graduate, going to be an English teacher. She said she had a terrible time understanding the reading. So just out of curiosity I opened a book lying on my desk and asked her to read a paragraph for me. Well, she proceeded to read the paragraph--in three word units. When she finished I asked her to tell me what she had read, and she didn't have the slightest idea. She was not reading in terms of grammatical structure.*

* *A College student?*

* *Yes. She was not able to decode the input, because it hadn't*

come in grammatically.

** *This is not an irrelevant question at all. What do you thing of speed reading where presumably readers are not reading in terms of grammatical structures either?*

* *I think speed reading is just speeding up the processing--speeding up the scanning.*

* *I think that's what they are doing.*

* *That's what they say they're doing.*

* *What they say they're doing is one thing, what you actually end up doing in speed reading is something else. I think it's exactly what he said. You spead up your scanning process and lots of times what you do is teach yourself to guess correctly what the clues are that you're not looking at. You learn to think in terms of larger and larger blocks of structure so that you'll only need a very small part of it to correctly guess the part that you haven't actually read. You actually have to look at less and less. But you're still reading in terms of full syntactic units, I'm sure. I don't see how you can avoid that and get the meaning of it--and speed readers in fact do improve their comprehension. Over and over again it's been demonstrated that the faster readers are also the ones who remember more and who get more of the points out of it, and so on. Slow readers are slow in every respect.*

* *So the fast ones are reading probably more in terms of syntactic structure?*

* *Right. More rather than less.*

** *Well, how about this one? It seems to me that we're not semantic purists, we don't listen to somebody's sentence and very carefully take it apart and.....*

* *Yes.*

** *..... so in fact we're getting a lot of communication cues from a variety of stimuli.*

* *Wait a minute. The fact that we don't stop and take it apart doesn't mean that we're not making use of every bit of information that's there, does it? How do you know what kind of processing goes on up here?*

** *Well, let me put it this way then. We agreed in an earlier exchange when you said "Yeah" and I said "O.K.?" and you said "O.K." again, that* we were in fact communicating in spite of the fact that there wasn't much semenatic content to deal with.

* Yes.

** Now, obviously there are devices in language that we use, for instance, "you know" is one. Various cue words like this imply that there is meaning more than is conveyed in the natural language itself. Is this right?

* I would have thought that what that particular one signifies is that I'm checking w'th you to see that you're still with me and furthermore to inform you that I'm not finished yet--nothing more than that. Isn't that all it does?

* When you throw this thing in it means you're hesitating, you, the speaker, are hesitating. You don't want to lose the attention of your auditors. You want them to stay with you: So you're indicating that you're going on, so wait a second and we'll get there. I don't think you're saying really what you know seems to apply on the surface, namely that they really know what you're saying and all the background. I don't think it means that at all. I think it's just a way of saying, stick with me, I'm checking to see if you're still following what I've said. It doesn't say more than that, does it?

* I can see an argument about this particular example, but somebody could say "all right" and that seems to be a kind of validation marker.

* They're checking to see if the other guy is still with you.

* Not only are you still with me, but that you do accept what I have said up until th's point--O.K.? So there may be a sort of harking back to the train of thought that's gone before.

** But we do have a lot of cue reduction devices, don't we? I think they're exemplified best by the story of the men's club where the funniest stories had been told for so long that they had become familiar to everybody. So they just gave each story a number. Then the speaker would stand up and say "Twenty-three" and everybody would laugh. There's a vague element of truth in the moral of the story. So if in fact Marvin and I have shared an experience, it may be sufficient for one word to cue us.

* Granted, but it didn't happen syntactically, it didn't happen

linguistically. It happened out of that shared experience. I mean you know there might have been some gesture which would have keyed it in just as well.

** Yes.

* I don't think there's anything linguistic about this.

* You've got another kind of thing though, where a word might refer to discourse that's preceded. For example, somebody says "what does that mean?" In that case the participants might very well know what is being referenced and as well have a recollected meaning for it, so that without providing the answers to the question they move on.

* Yeah, but there are opposing cases to the kind you're talking about which are just as transparent in a different sense. Take this one. Suppose Rudy has been sitting over there and making a claim for the last five minutes. Now clearly I've understood every word he has said and then when he finishes making his claim and explaining his position, I'll look at him and say "I don't understand". Now, I don't mean at all that I don't understand the words. What I mean is that having processed all the words very carefully, I either see some sort of contradiction here which I can't imagine he would be guilty of, or I can't see what possible evidence would support the point of view that he is presenting. Yet I know him to be a smart guy and therefore he wouldn't present it unless he had evidence. So when I say I don't understand, it doesn't mean, "I don't understand", it means, "explain what you are saying".

** Well, I suppose the question I really want to ask is this one. Due to the fact that we have a variety of short-circuiting and short-handling devices in language.....

* Which is what I just used.

** ..... yes, should we encourage teachers; (a) to be sensitive to them and, (b) not to be concerned when they themselves use them or the children use them.

* Is there really some reason to have to say that? Everybody talks this way in all languages. You have these shorthand devices. It's completely universal. Not the same devices, but the same kinds of devices. It's universal in all dialects. It's not any more characteristic of Standard English than it is of Non-Standard. It's

a totally universal kind of phenomenon. Why do we have to say anything about it? The only thing we have to do, is to warn them to ignore any advice that they should speak only in complete sentences. If someone tells them that, then someone is giving idiotic advice which we need to teach them to ignore. But beyond that what do we have to do?

** Well, my behavioral observations of classrooms lead me to believe that often teachers are constrained by this feeling that they must speak.....

* Because someone taught them that way..... who..... educationists?

** Yes.

* Then they're the ones that we've got to..... I mean your program is going to be a totally new program, where the educationists are not going to be allowed to tell them the kind of things they've been telling them for the last five hundred years. This is one of the things that they got to not tell them.

** O.K. That's the point I wanted to be read into the record.

* "They got to not tell them"--and I am a speaker of Standard English--but that's my casual English. "They got to not tell them". Obviously I can't say that in Standard English except casually, I mean, you know.

* How would you translate that into a Standard English sentence.

* "That you have to be sure not to tell them".

* I think another thing you might want to sensitize teachers to is illustrated by an example we have on tape involving ambiguity. The class was reading a selection about Sitting Bull and Annie Oakley and the teacher asked, "what was the best thing that happened to Annie, after the contest?" A little kid replies, "Oh, she got some money, she won a prize". The teacher said, "Yes, but..." (which was to say that was the wrong answer)..... "She got her husband". The question was ambiguous but the teacher, as far as I can see, effectively said, "No, that's the wrong answer, here's the right answer", when the child's answer was correct. So that I think teachers are unaware of the tremendous ambiguous ranges that they put before their kids with regard to acceptable and unacceptable behavior. And they expect them to read their minds in a way. I'm guilty of this myself as a teacher but.....

** We all are.

* But somehow in materials I've been observing in our videotapes,

some of these secondary and primary teachers are more guilty of it than.....

* *But you would agree that it's not really a linguistic problem but some sort of a pedagogical problem. I mean that should be just as true in a mathematics class as it is in a social science class or a language class or anything else.*

* *Well, the point is with regard to acceptable verbal responses being given by the students. Hopefully we can help teachers to be more appreciative of the range of responses , correct responses, available, given the question. Somehow they can come to see realistically the kinds of questions they're asking, so that they can then better appreciate the kind of answers they are going to get.*

* *Let's go round that again--"what was the best thing that happened to her?" I claim that is not syntactically or grammatically ambiguous. All it is, is that the word "what" has a number of possible different references. Of course, she had a particular one in mind.*

* *O.K., but this is ambiguity. I mean.....*

* *There is a difference. You can not call.....*

* *..... you are going to call it ambiguous--every sentence containing the word "what" ambiguous, and it is not. It is just vague with respect to its antecedent, because it's an indefinite pronoun.*

* *I would suppose that we could probably dicker about this for quite a while and not reach finality. Let's say then that vagueness and ambiguity are mixtures of the same thing.*

* *Would you agree of the question, "What does he want", that the non-interrogative paraphrase is that "he want something"? Because, if you agree to that, then you are going to have to agree with me that there was something which "what" replaces as I believe.....*

* *No. How about "which one does he want"?*

* *"Which one does he want"--"he wants either A or B".....*

* *But that's not exactly..... "what does he want" in a.....*

* *I agree, you raise a different question. "What does he want?" doesn't mean the same as "which one does he want?"*

* *If I say "what happened to her after", and everybody in the room is supposed to know--they know that something happened to her. They know what the possible answers are theoretically--it is not the case*

of "what does he want". That is, unless you are going to give me more context, that is vague--thatis vague. That has almost nothing to do with any kind of reality that has gone before.

* "What happened to her afterwards"?

* No, "what was the best thing that happened to her afterwards".

* That's still an indefinitely large number of possible things.

* But not given the story. You see, they were reading out of a book.

* That is not ambiguity in the technical sense of ambiguity.

* Let me make the statement that 98% of all teachers in America think that ambiguity means vague. They are perfect synonyms for each other.

* Don't you agree with the difference?

* Yes to me, but I'm a linguist--all my graduating college freshmen, most of them majors in English, they wouldn't.

* Fine. But wouldn't you agree then that it's not our job as linguists to try to teach them to be less vague or less ambiguous. Can we really undertake to solve the problem that is being raised.

* They like to claim that they have a function to teach clear thinking.

** Yes--to take your point from a different angle--do you think that your linguistic expert can teach teachers different ways to use questions, for example--that they can give them more skill and expertise...

* I don't know. Maybe we need some sort of language skill practitioner, or something like that--I don't know.

* There is not any evidence that I know of that linguists use language any better than any other corresponding academic group but.....

* Probably what I am shooting at here is a consideration of problems having to do with meanings as we understand them I think. (If we understand them better).

* That's a big if.

* ..... to teach clear thinking would probably have something to do with meaning, whether you are going to call it vagueness or ambiguity. I think I can still make an argument out for structural ambiguity, and lexical ambiguity, and when we get to questions, there is a question of what kind of question it is--if it's either one of them.....

* Are you suggesting a course in linguistic semantics?

* Yes, something like that.

* There is a point that is operatively relevant here. Studies have shown that the average teacher asks a question something like once every ten seconds or something of that sort. This really means that she is dominating....

* Oh, yes.

* And not getting much of an answer back on that basis.

* ..... and if you really are interested in this oral language development thing then I think we have got to change the whole approach to the structure of questioning. We have to question the classroom teaching operation where the teacher just questions, the kid gets out half a sentence and she pops another question at him, and that sort of thing.

** Our own research shows that teachers are emitters about 58% of the time.

* Are what?

** They are emitters--they are talking for 58% of the time. The remaining 42% is shared with the rest of the kids--not necessarily, of course, on an equal basis.

* At what level?

** Grades I, VI and XI--I am talking about on the average.

* I, VI and XI.

** There's a 715 page final report that documents it.

* No, I prefer to believe you. I am merely being shocked, I am not being sceptical. I visited one very, very large High School. In the elementary school the teachers were doing very good oral work but at the high school level in 8 different classes we heard not one student utter one word in an entire afternoon--all seat work.

** You might check on another phenomenon. In my study I found that the "why"-questions were reserved for private communication--either in small groups or in a personal exchange.

* What kind of questions?

** "Why" questions.

* He means the yes-no questions were the ones asked in the classroom.

** No.

* No!

** No, not necessarily. When the kids sought for reasons (the teachers didn't seek for reasons much) when the kids sought reasons, they did it privately--presumably because they were discouraged from doing it in public. That would have been disquieting to the teacher. I personally think that teachers ask questions from quite ulterior motives often, for example: (1) so they can continue with the program that they had in mind--they ask the pupil who will give them the answer that they want, (2)to get rewards so they can feel that they are good teachers simply because they can get the right answer out of their kids, and so on.

* Makes sense.

* Anybody who has worked in TOESL or TOEFL cringes at this whole business of how much the teacher dominates the speaking situation.

* I don't think we have got onto the record how much phonological skill, how much phonetics, the teacher ought to have. I think she ought to have some awareness of the way in which you produce sounds so that you can become aware of such things as assimilation--recognize the quality of some of these differences--not in a critical way, in an understanding way so that she can be objective about the matter. I think she ought to have some control over a broad system of phonetic transcription so she can record at least the gross features of youngsters' speech.

* Isn't it the case that if we had in this program the kind of linguistic sophistication training that we have been talking about on various occasions to-day, that it would necessarily include that much phonetics--I don't see how you can escape it.

* But we have to have that on the record.

* I think so too.

* But I mean that--you can't really give them any sophistication about differences in pronunciation, and so on, unless they have got that much phonetics--I mean, that much phonetics is sort of a necessary condition.

* Also, sound symbol correspondence for reading.

* Right, that's another reason why you have to have it in there. I don't think you would get any argument on that. Do you want further justification of it? Or are you convinced? You will find plenty of

evidence of it in the literature, you won't have any trouble digging lots of arguments for it.

** *O.K.*

* *That's one thing probably every linguist that you could possibly have here would agree on without any hesitation.*

* *Have we said enough about some background history of the language. To me that goes without saying--almost.*

* *..... that goes (for my book) only if it is motivated by the desire to explain how these differences came about--the naturalness of language change and the naturalness of language diversity, and so on.*

* *..... and related to language acquisition.*

* *..... what kind of variation?*

* *..... internal change rather than external history.*

* *Right, quite. It should not be taught as something for its own sake unless there is that much room in the program.*

* *In the past we have often had these people who are just absolutely steeped in the history of the English language (we still have)and they take the position that: "language has changed down to this day, but my God, it's not going to change any more!"*

* *So what I think we need to do is integrate it into your goal of understanding the nature of language.*

* *Jolly good point.*

* *We really have talked about a course or even conceivably, a suite of courses that elementary school teachers, or that teachers who are going to a good job with disadvantaged children, ought to have. We have said that it ought to include some 'de-ethnocentricisation', some history of the language and some phonetics among other things. It seems to me that it's still the case that what is absolutely central to an understanding of the nature of language and to the notion of enriching one's command of language and so forth, is syntax. And syntax is not an easy thing to teach about. I still think you have got to have a really significant component of your program that is devoted to linguistic theory at the level of syntax, but only illustrated in English. I don't mean a systematic grammar of English at all.*

* *..... no handling of syntactic problems of other languages.*

* *That's right, either way, don't you thing?*

* Yes, I was waiting, that's my abstract manipulation.

** O.K. Now, what sort of education is necessary here? How much familiarity with rules of syntax does the teacher need to have?

* I would like to see you--I don't know about the familiarity with rules--I would like to see the ability to take a sentence that say a child produces and then start providing paraphrases for it, and sampling the other kids in a class to see how they would say it and whether or not they would accept these versions. Then I would want them to go into the literature and show people doing these things. Then take another example, and run it through, in essence, a paradigm of paraphrases, showing that certain things are happening to it.

* The notion of syntactic structure--the nature of syntactic structure probably has to be taught fairly explicitly--to the teachers. I don't see how you can avoid it if you are going to have sophisticated teachers who can look at the syntax of a child from a minority background who's English is significantly different from the teacher's own English. Unless the teacher is reasonably sophisticated in syntax she won't be able to look at the child's language sympathetically and understand the nature of the differences. I mean sophisticated to the standard of about a quarter course or so in syntax. I think you can teach what you need to know in about that much time, one third of the year, one course. I don't see how you can avoid that much training and do the job. Do you agree?

* Yes, I would agree. I would think that you need maybe two courses--one in syntax and the other in the development we have been talking about.

* If you do a good background course in English language broadly conceived, a dialect history, with the phonetics in it, then you come to the syntax, you have a really good, solid base.

* You are not going to scare them right-a-way. They won't be too intimidated.

* That's about the right way to do it.

* Don't waste taime in the syntax course still trying to convince them of these absolutely basic notions about what is going on in language.

** We are obviously gradually subsiding. Are there other points that we need to get onto the record.

* I second an anthropology course.

* If you have one, I'm all for it but first the instructors will have to be somewhat sympathetic with the purposes of the teacher students who are taking it. I just heard yesterday about one anthropology course for such prospective teachers in Indian schools which was not geared to their needs. The anthropologist in charge did not have the teachers' problems in mind.

* He messed things up completely.

* That's right, absolutely right.

** In other words, you are talking about 'anthropology for teaching'.

* Exactly, anthropological linguistics for teaching, that's right. I would think that you can't just take any old cultural anthropology course and assume it's going to do the job.....

** O.K.

* We used to have a superb course at Texas called Applied Anthropology--it got through to people on this cultural relativity bit.

* Yeah, that's the central notion--it's got to be illustrated with a whole variety of examples to the point.

** I think that the cultural relativity message is going to come through every consortium that we have. This will be the one key thought that unifies the variety of contributions we are going to get.

* What does the teacher need to know? We have said the teacher needs to know something about syntax.....

* ..... about phonetics, history, dialect variation.

* ..... the value systems of cultural minorities.

** Now you are becoming a sociologist--anthropologist.

* A domestic anthropologist.

* Domestic?

* Anthropologists don't concern themselves with their own culture. We have two categories of anthropologists, real ones and domestic ones.

* The second are all prostitutes--we recognize that.

* The second are probably all linguists.

* Exactly what's the trouble with linguists?

** I think the details of our linguistics program will have to wait for a subsequent occasion. Then we will go back to the linguists and say, "now we want to make people culturally sensitive with respect to *language, how do the linguists think we can do it? Please give us the evidence, the benefits of your knowledge so that we can set up a program that is really designed expressly to do this. We are not hooked on providing a credit or providing a formula to fit in with the College of Education or the University. We are concerned with knowing what is best to do".*

In the meantime we will deliberate on the many points you have made to-day. When we have done so, we will MacArthur-like return. Can I however, at this stage express our gratitude for your willingness to come and participate in the project and particularly for the way in which you have given us the means for sharpening and focussing our own ideas.

SECTION II

This section contains the greater part of the material abstracted during the literature search. The items are presented alphabetically (by author) according to the following convention. The bibliographical data comes first. Next comes a brief descriptive statement of the nature of the item. Then, under "A", are listed any data supported points, or any points known to be data supportable. Under "B" are listed assertions made in the source material but which appear to be data free. Recommendations made by authors follow, under the "C" heading. Finally, where the abstractor has seen fit, some comments are listed under "D". These mostly indicate what other information is contained in the source item.

It will be remembered that the abstractors were graduate linguists and their linguistics orientation, as we intended, will have influenced their judgements. However, an educational requirement placed on them served to focus their attention also. We required the searchers to base their selection on whether or not they, as linguists, felt the information before them could be thought to be germane, even remotely germane, to the teacher of urban disadvantaged children. In so far as they thought that there was information here that the teacher, or the trainer of teachers, of disadvantaged children ought to know or appreciate, they were to include it.

Among the items in this section are several for which no detail is included. These items are usually the more substantive ones which, for our purposes, defied summary.

Adkins, Dorothy C., and others. Preliminary evaluation of a language curriculum for pre-school children. Final Report #OEO-4219. 1967.

A report of a 1-week training program at the University of Hawaii in which seven teachers and six aides were instructed in the use of the Bereiter-Engelmann strategy for language programs.

A.1. The Bereiter-Engelmann approach involves concentration upon the development of language skills and facility with basic sentence usage.
2. 49 experimental pupils were administered an experimental language curriculum.
3. 20 control group pupils received a more extensive but less intensive Bereiter-Engelmann language curriculum.
4. A group of analog tasks of non-verbal responses was developed to complement learning tasks of experimental group.
5. Post-tests results on the School Readiness Tasks showed no significant differences between the two groups.

Alexanian, Sandra. Head Start Evaluation and Research Center, Boston University. Report D-1, Language Project: The effects of a teacher developed pre-school language training program on first grade reading achievement. 1967.

Thirty-five Head Start children received special instruction in language skills. A control group of 25 Head Start children received no special program.

1. Teachers of the experimental classes attended workshop sessions provided by curriculum experts and received special materials, and classroom visits from the experts, who presented demonstrations.
2. All children were administered Murphy Durrell Reading Readiness Analysis during the beginning and end of the summer Head Start session.
3. At this time, final testing results after one semester of first grade are not available.

Allen, Harold B. Expanding frontiers in dialect study. Paper. NAT Council of Teacher's of English, Convention, 1967.

The study of regional and social dialects is offering valuable assistance to language teachers.

D.1. The following field studies by linguistic geographers are available:
    a. Atlases describing regional language variations,
    b. studies indicating vocabulary change and regional variations in grammar and pronunciation,
    c. maps showing frequency of distribution of language items,
    d. files of alphabetized lexical information of regional patterns.
2. Because many Americans are handicapped by non-standard varieties of English, the study of social dialects of Negroes and other ethnic groups has recently assumed prominence.
3. Language patterns of non-urban groups are also being studied, giving special attention to language variations which correlate with age, education and social class.

Altus, W.D. Racial and bilingual group differences in predictability and in mean aptitude test scores in an Army special training center. Psychological Bulletin, 1945, 42, 310-20.

Experiment.

A Supported points are 1) less aculturation on the part of bilinguals (American Indian, Mexican, Filipino, Chinese) than on the part of monolinguals (Negroes, whites).

C Recommendations are 1) additional training for more underpriviledged and less aculturated groups.

Amsden, Constance. A reading program for Mexican-American children. California State College at L.A. Report #BR-5-0559 and #RD-374. Contract OEO-6-85-070.

This program in an East Los Angeles school was designed to develop oral language skills and to reinforce traditional cultural values in the Mexican-Ameican community.

A.1. Data were obtained on reading achievement and oral language development.

2. Independent studies were undertaken of
   - a. Spanish language proficiency of the children.
   - b. Spanish influence on the children's oral English.

C.3. Recommendations
   - a. Emphasis on parent participation.
   - b. Individualized instruction.
   - c. Self-instruction.
   - d. Cultural awareness.

Anastasi, Anna and Fernando A. Cordova. Some effects of bilingualism upon the intelligence test performance of Puerto Rican children in New York City. The Journal of Educational Psychology, 1953, 44, 1-19.

Experiment.

A Supported points are 1) using the Cattell Culture Free Intelligence Test Forms 2A and 2B, the performance of Puerto Rican children was below Cattell's norm.

B Hypothetical points are: point 1) above is attributable to 1) the extremely low socio-economic level of the Puerto Rican children, 2) their bilingualism which makes them deficient in both Spanish and English, 3) their lack of test sophistication, 4) poor emotional adjustment to school.

C Recommendations are 1) better orientation in education.

Anastasi, Anna and C. deJesus. Language development and non-verbal I.Q. of Puerto Rican pre-school children in New York City. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48, 357-66.

Experiment.

A. Supported points are 1) Puerto Rican pre-school children are shown to exceed both white and Negro pre-school children in mean sentence length and maturity of sentence structure.

B. Hypothetical points are 1) point 1) above may be attributed to more adult contact in the home environment of the Puerto Ricans.

Anastasi, Anna and Rita Y. D'Angelo. A comparison of Negro and white pre-school children in language development and Goodenough Draw-a-Man I.Q. The Pedagogical Seminary and Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1952, 81, 147-65.

Experiment.

A. Supported points are 1) Negro pre-school children are shown to exhibit less mature linguistic development than white pre-school children; 2) in racially unmixed neighborhoods, the Negro males exceeded the Negro females in language maturity whereas 3) white females surpassed white males in language maturity.

B. Hypothetical points are 1) points 2) and 3) above may be due to variance in social pressures in the two racial groups.

Anderson, James G. and William Johnson. Socio-cultural determinants of achievement among Mexican American students. New Mexico State University, University Park. 1968.

The preliminary findings of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory's Mathematics Project are presented in this monograph.

A.1. Data were collected and analyzed for 263 high school students (grades 7-12) in a Southwestern community.
  2. The results of a preliminary analysis suggest that Mexican-American children may not have as much confidence in their ability to succeed in school as their classmates.
  3. Achievement in both English and mathematics appears to be highly affected by the child's confidence in his ability to succeed in school and by the emphasis the parents place on education, while his mastery of English appears to be influenced by the language spoken in the home and by the father's educational background.

Angel, Frank. Program content to meet the educational needs of Mexican-Americans. New Mexico State University. 1968.

While the Mexican-American needs to learn Anglo behaviors as quickly as possible, he should and has the right to retain his own culture.

This paper includes five areas of an educational program which are essential to a good education for the Mexican-American.

C.1. The language needs of the Mexican-American necessitate the use of English as a second language through the elementary and secondary schools.
  2. Much emphasis is needed inthe area of cognitive development.
  3. Proper affective development, if left unattended, may bring about grave psychological costs.
  4. There is a need for programs which will foster better inter-group relations.
  5. There is a need for good occupational education at the secondary level.

Arnold, Richard D. San Antonio Language Research Project, 1965-66 (Year Two) Findings. Austin. Texas University Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. 1966.

A study to determine the effects of oral-aural teaching techniques on pupils' gains in reading proficiency involved 1418 pupils.

A.1. A sample of first graders and a sample of second graders were each subdivided into four groups.
   a. Group one - was exposed to oral-aural teaching methods in English for the presentation of science materials.
   b. Group two - was taught same content in oral-aural Spanish.
   c. Group three - received science content without oral-aural methods.
   d. Group four (control) - composed of a cross section of socio-economic levels in contrast to the three disadvantaged groups, had neither the experimental science materials nor the oral-aural instruction.
2. Scores on reading achievement and intelligence for all groups provided data treated by analysis of covariance.
   a. Findings indicated no significant difference in the oral-aural method in the second grade.
   b. Results from first grade rated oral-aural English treatment as the most successful of all.
   c. A possible explanation of the differency in results may be that the first grade teachers had had a year's experience with the experimental method.

Arnold, Robert. Why Juan can't read. Commonweal, 1962, 76, 110-12.

Think piece.

B. Hypothetical points are 1) the deficient education of 25% of U.S. urban children is due to the teachers' lack of understanding of and conflict with the culture and language of children being taught.

C. Recommendations are: 1) educational structure must be altered to accommodate these people.

Arnold, Richard D. Retention in reading of disadvantaged Mexican-American children during the summer months. Paper. I.R.A. Conference, Boston. 1968.

Three groups of children were tested to determine changes in reading achievement between second and third grade.

A.1. During the school year 102 received intensive oral-aural English language instruction while 67 children received intensive oral-aural Spanish language instruction.
2. A control group of 115 did not receive intensive language instruction.
3. The groups were tested in the Spring and Fall with-
   a. The Metropolitan Achievement Tests,
   b. Tests of Reading, Inter-American Series,
   c. Prueba de Lectura, Serie Inter-Americana.
4. Results --
   a. Oral-aural Spanish group showed significant gains on the vocabulary subtest and on total score on the Test of Reading. They showed a significant loss on the speed sub-test of the Prueba de Lectura.
   b. Oral-aural English group showed no significant changes, while the control group showed significant losses over the Summer vacation period.

Ausubel, David P. The Effects of Cultural Deprivation on Learning Patterns. Audio-Visual Instruction, X, January, 1965, pp. 157-61.
The author examines the effect of environmental deprivation on the development of intelligence and the extent to which such effects are reversible and irreversible.

1. The culturally deprived environment breeds poor perceptual discrimination skills; inability to use adults as sources of information, correction and reality testing, and as instruments for satisfying curiosity; and an impoverished language symbolic system; and a paucity of information, concepts, and relational propositions.
2. The culturally deprived child shows most intellectual retardation in the area of language development. The child is seldom spoken to or read to by his parents.
3. The language of the culturally deprived child is more concrete, expressive and informal than that of the middle class child.
4. The culturally deprived child works more slowly than the middle class child because of the former's distractability, unfamiliarity with formal language, impaired self-confidence and unresponsiveness to time pressure.
5. The effects of cultural deprivation on intellectual development are partly irreversible.
   a. New growth always proceeds from the already actualized capacity.
   b. If a child's genic potentialities for verbal development remain undeveloped in early childhood, other facets of intelligence (e.g. mechanical, social) become differentially more highly developed. An individual's once undifferentiated intelligence has been committed to other areas, and is less free to respond to an enriched verbal environment.
6. An optimal learning environment for culturally deprived pupils focuses on two aspects of cognitive readiness for learning - readiness in terms of general level of intellectual functioning; and readiness in terms of specific subject matter background.
7. Programmed instruction promotes readiness by deferring the presentation of new material until previous material has been thoroughly learned.

Babin, Patrick. Bilingualism; A Bibliography. 1968.

This bibliography is a selected listing of books, monographs, Journal articles, unpublished papers, and bibliographies focusing on bilingualism. The list includes only the most significant items with respect to the thoroughness of treatment, or those which illustrate new steps in the development of studies on the subject.

Bailey, Dorothy Dee. Teaching English to the culturally different. West Chester State College, Pennsynvania. 1967.

Students in a class in the Teaching of Secondary English at West Chester College, Pennsynvania, compiled this annotated bibliography of reading materials for use with culturally-deprived students.

D.1. Recommended books for the student are divided into three

categories:
a. Prose
b. Poetry
c. Textbooks--particularly those which could aid students in improving language and reading skills.

2. A pedagogical bibliography for teachers of the culturally different lists both books and periodical articles.
3. Also included is:
a. A report on visits to public schools in Coatesville and Downingtown, Pennsylvania.
b. A report on a conference with coordinators for intergroup education in the Philadelphia Public Schools.
c. The general conclusions of the research group about the characteristics of culturally deprived youth and the legitimate aims of English programs for these students.

Bailey, Beryl Loftman. Toward a new perspective in Negro English. American Speech, 1965, 40, 171-77.

Literary research.

A. Supported points are 1) differences in auxiliary tense markers between Negro English (NE) and Standard English (SE), 2) differences in negation markers between NE and SE, 3) differences in possessive markers between NE and SE.

C. Recommendations are 1) further research into NE by linguistically sophisticated native speakers.

Baratz, Joan C. A bi-dialectal test for determining language proficiency. Document #Ad-667-800. Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, Springfield, Virginia, 1968.

This experiment was designed to compare the language behavior of Standard and Non-Standard English speakers when asked to repeat Standard and Non-Standard sentences.

A.1. 47 third and fifth graders at a Negro school in Washington, D.C., and 30 of their white counterparts at a suburban Maryland school were asked to repeat 30 taped sentences.
2. Fifteen sentences were in Standard English and 15 were in Negro Non-Standard dialect.
3. Findings -
a. White subjects did significantly better in repeating Standard English sentences.
b. Negro children were significantly better in repeating Negro Non-Standard sentences.
c. The author feels that the language deficiency attributed to the low income child is not a language deficit so much as a difficulty in code switching when the second code (Standard English) is not as well learned as the first (Non-Standard English).
d. In a second task involving identification of the race of the speaker, high percentages of white and Negro children identified a Standard English sentence as being spoken by a white man and a Non-Standard sentence as being spoken by a Negro.

Baratz, Joan C. Language and Cognitive Assessment of Negro Children; assumptions and research needs. Paper. American Psych. Association, Meeting. 1968.

The paper focuses attention on the kinds of research assumptions that are present in the literature on language.

B.1. Three major professions are concerned with describing the language and cognitive abilities of black children -
  a. educators, who believe these children are 'verbally destitute'.
  b. psychologists, who assert that either these children don't talk or if they do, their speech is a 'deterrent to cognitive growth',
  c. linguists, who have examined the language and found it a "well ordered, highly developed language system which in many aspects is different from Standard English'.
2. The kind of responses black children make in auditory discrimination tests are based on the sound usage they have learned in their environment.
3. Because their syntax also differs from Standard English, the psychologist, unaware of the rules of Negro Non-Standard has interpreted these differences as evidence of 'linguistic underdevelopment'.
C.4. The psychologist must learn to distinguish between the questions (a) has this child acquired language? and (b) has this child acquired competence in Standard English?

Baratz, Joan and Edna Povich. Grammatical Constructions in the language of the Negro pre-school child. 1968.

Language samples of 20 Negro Head Start children in Washington D.C. were analyzed using Lee's Developmental Sentence Types Model and then compared with results that Minyuk obtained for middle class pre-schoolers.

A.1. The disadvantaged child is not delayed in language acquisition although he uses a qualitatively different language system than his middle class counterpart.
2. His language contains many forms that are identical to Standard English, but also contains many structures which are considered to be restricted forms.
3. These forms are acceptable in lower class Negro dialect and indicated a level of syntactic development where transformations are being used appropriately.
4. The lower class Negro child is using the same forms as the lower class Negro adult, indicating that he has learned the forms of his linguistic environment.

Barritt, Loren. The changes in psycholinguistic functioning of children after one year in an 'integrated' school. Report #BR-6-1784-1. Contract OEO 3-6-061784-0508. 1967.

The study was conducted to assess the changes in the psycholinguistic functioning of Negro and white kindergarten and first grade pupils one year after the integration of six suburban schools.

A.1. The Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability was administered

before and after school reassignment.
2. It was found that the program had no noticeable effect on the sending school pupils, who continued as before to score lower than their suburban counterparts.
3. Children originally in the receiving schools maintained and even improved their performance level on the language scales.
4. The average gain in raw score points across all the test sub-scales was:
   a. +2.9 for the children from the sending school,
   b. +2.8 for the comparison school group (50% Negro non-sending school in the same area),
   c. +3.7 for the receiving schools group.
5. The greatest gain for the sending school group was 4.4 points on the auditory decoding sub-scale.

Barritt, Loren and others. A comparison of the psycholinguistic functioning of 'educationally-deprived' and 'educationally advantaged' children. Ann Arbor, Michigan University Center for Research and Language Behavior. 1965.

Two disadvantaged groups and one advantaged group of kindergarten and first grade children were tested on the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities.

A.1. Scores were compared, and an analysis of profile similarities showed that groups were most similar on sub-tests requiring sequential habits.
2. Greatest performance discrepancies among groups occurred on analogs, vocabulary and grammar sub-tests.
3. Results indicate that strong syntactic habits are characteristic of higher-level functioning and that sequential language habits are characteristic of more primitive levels of language ability.
4. Two hypotheses are proposed in explanation of the results.
   a. Performance on sequentail tests is dependent on the relatively fixed capacity of a subject's short-term memory, while other sub-tests require the-ability to 'structure' learning which is more dependent upon experience.
   b. Since educationally deprived children have not developed the higher-level facility with their language, they are relatively free from hypotheses about learning tasks.

Barritt, Loren S. and others. The immediate memory span of children from 'advantaged' and 'disadvantaged' backgrounds. Report #Br 6-1784-4. Contract OEO-3-6-061784-0508. 1967.

Three groups of first and second grade children, two lower-class and one middle class, were asked to learn and recall sequences of words at four levels of conceptual difficulty - nonsense syllables, high frequency nouns, anomalous sentences, and meaningful sentences.

A.1. Students' scores on an auditory memory test revealed that it was easier for the children to learn grammatically structured - and thus meaningful - information.
2. Though the older children in general learned better than the younger children, they did not necessarily learn more as the

task level increased.

3. There were no significant differences in the memory span of lower-class and middle-class children.

Barrutia, Richard. Overcoming cultural barriers. Forum of the Modern Language Assoc. of South California, Vol. 6, No. 2, Dec. 1967.

Bell, Paul W. A beginning reading program for linguistically handicapped. Paper. International Reading Association Conference. 1966.

Native English speaking children with Non-Standard speech habits and bilingual children must learn to read and write Standard English if they are to succeed in school and achieve maximum social mobility.

C.1. The "Miami Linguistic Readers" series was developed to meet the needs of the linguistically handicapped.

2. The series, designed specifically for first and second graders, consists of a readiness unit, twenty one pupils' books organized into fifteen levels, two 'big books', and a seat work booklet and teacher's manual for each level.

3. The Miami program represents a creation of new instructional materials, and breaks with tradition in the area of organization and to some extent in the area of content.

Beller, E. Kuno. A Study of Cognitive and Social Functioning. Project II; A study of the Attitudes of Parents of Deprived Children. Project III. Report #OEO-1410-Proj. II & III. 1967.

Project deals with characteristic functioning of lower class educationally disadvantaged pre-school children, the impact of the pre-school experience, and the personality of the child and his readiness to gain from the educational process.

A.1. Disadvantaged pre-school children functioned intellectually and verbally below their middle class peers and were 8 months behind them in language development.

2. Longitudinal data indicate that children who have had pre-school training scored higher on test batteries in first grade, that their language development is superior, and that their academic achievement and attitudes toward learning are significantly higher.

3. Early education intervention is valuable to the development of self-confidence and greater trust in their environment.

4. A study of mother-child interaction will continue, and a study of gainers, non-gainers, and losers is underway.

Bender, Martin L. A voluntary pre-kindergarten language development and reading program for the entire four year old population of a city (investigation of machine taught reading). Final Report. Report #BR-6-1383. Grant OE9-1-6-06383-2096. Mount Vernon Public Schools, New York. 1968.

Four studies by the Mount Vernon Public Schools involved machine teaching reading to 240 disadvantaged children from the Children's Center and the Child Development Center.

A.1. The Children's Center subjects attended 1-hour sessions while

the Child Development Center subjects attended 3-hour sessions.
2. Experimental groups from both centers used the Edison-Responsive Environment Talking Typewriter and the Story-Telling Automatic Reading Tutor machines with programs which utilized linguistic vowel-sounds methods.
3. Control groups used the same machines but did not receive program training.
4. Results;
    a. Superior performance by the program subjects, but no significant differences in the performance of program subjects using different teaching machines.
    b. 1-hour session as effective as the 3-hour session.

C.5. Greater consideration should be given to more economical program systems. Class time could be reduced by half without loss in learning.

Bereiter, Carl. Academic instruction and preschool children. In Lanaguage Programs for the Disadvantaged. Champaign, Illinois. NCTE. 1965.

Limited Research.

A. Supported points are 1) certain disadvantaged children do not command certain grammatical structures felt necessary for logical thought processes.

B. Hypothetical assumptions are 1) intelligence tests indicate language development.

C. Recommendations are 1) limiting the scope of aid to disadvantaged children language programs to teaching those logical mechanisms of Standard English.

Bereiter, Carl and Siegfried Engelmann. Language learning activities for the disadvantaged child. New York. B'Nai B'Rith. 1968.

This booklet describes gamelike activities which are designed to facilitate language learning among disadvantaged children.

C.1. The discussion emphasizes the important role of language in cognitive development and the need for a structured program of activities.
2. Fourteen activities (e.g. The Fooler Game, The Preposition Game, and the Question-Asking Game) are described.
3. Each activity is designed to elicit maximum student participation in the learning process.
4. Directions for using the activities are provided and large amounts of sample dialogue are included.

Berman, Carol and Edna K. Monsees. Speech and language screening in a Summer Head Start Program. Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, Vol. 33, No. 2,May 1968.

A team of two speech pathologists and three audiologists conducted speech, hearing and language screening of 286 children enrolled in Summer Head Start programs in Washington, D.C.

1. Examined were Negroes and recently immigrated Indians and Latin Americans.
2. The variety of English spoken by the children was viewed as

Non-Standard but not sub-standard.

3. Only those aspects of the child's language that might handicap his ability to function effectively in society's mainstream were considered speech defects.
4. Each child's overall communicative ability was assessed and recommendations made according to the gravity of the defect.
5. Head Start programs were to provide the necessary enrichment for some children while others were referred to school speech clinics or the Children's Hearing and Speech Center of Children's Hospital.

Bernstein, Basil. Some sociological determinancs of perception. British Journal of Sociology, 1958, 9, 159-174.

Experiment.

A. Supported points are 1) Certain verbal tests show class distinction where non-verbal intelligence tests don't.

B. Hypothetical points are 1) Middle class language is more hierarchic, elaborate, and communicable than is lower class language.

C. Recommendations are 1) Further study using nursery school children. 2) Democratization of the educational facilities.

Bernstein, Basil. Language and social class. British Journal of Sociology, 1960, 11, 271-76.

A. Supported points are 1) Verbal tests show class distinction where non-verbal intelligence tests do not.

B. Hypothetical points are 1) Middle class speech is more conducive to verbal elaboration where lower class speech is more restricted and limited as to language use.

Bernstein, B.B. Social Class, Linguistic Codes and Grammatical Elements. Language and Speech, 5, 1962.

Brengleman, Frederick H. and John Manning. A linguistic approach to the teaching of English as a foreign language to kindergarten pupils whose primary language is Spanish. Fresno State College. Report #CRP 2821. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Study was designed to determine whether a linguistically oriented program of English designed for children with Spanish-speaking backgrounds could significantly accelerate pupil control of English.

A.1. Measurements were made on three population groupings based on prior experience with the procedures and materials employed.

2. Conclusions -
   a. English grammar can be learned through formal classroom procedures; the difficulties are in the area of instructional practices rather than linguistic theoretical design.
   b. Most significant improvements in phonology and syntax are made by pupils of minimal English facility.
   c. Boys respond more significantly to phonological instructions than girls.

B.3. Major obstacle in designing more efficient English language programs is the wide range of phoneme production abilities of beginning kindergarten Spanish-speaking pupils.

Brigham, Thomas, A. Head Start Evaluation and Research Center, University of Kansas. Report No. IIB, An experimental analysis of verbal imitation in pre-school children. 1967.

To provide insights into language learning and speech therapy, three 4-year old boys were subjects of an experiment involving reinforcement of verbal imitation.

1. Phase I - The child was given candy and praise each time he correctly reproduced the stimulus word.
2. Phase II - Similar to phase I except that Russian words were added but never reinforced.
3. Phase III - Subjects were not reinforced for imitating English or Russian words. Later reinforcement of English words was reinstated.
4. The results -
   a. During experimental phases when reinforcement was tied to correct imitative responses, the correct imitation of English and Russian words increased, even though Russian words were not reinforced.
   b. When reinforcement was not tied to correct imitation of English words, correct imitation of English and Russian words decreased.

Brooks, Charlotte K. Some approaches to teaching Standard English as a second language. Elementary English, 1964, 41, 728-33.

B. Hypothetical points are 1) teachers have little or no understanding of Non-Standard English speakers; 2) culturally different and culturally deprived are often grouped together with remedial students; 3) the grouping in 2) does not meet the need for teaching the culturally different and culturally deprived Standard English.

C. Recommendations are 1) Recognize and treat cultural difference and cultural deprivation as two different problems; 2) utilize the teaching of English as a second language in both the above problems; 3) make teachers more linguistically competent; 4) approach both Standard English and Non-Standard English as acceptable and necessary in the proper context.

Broz, James J. Jr. Trends and implications of current research in dialectology. 1967.

Linguistic studies in Chicago, Detroit, London, New York City, and Washington D.C. are reviewed.

B.1. They suggest a current trend in dialect research-narrow linguistic, interdisciplinary analyses of language variation in cities.
2. Another trend studied is the description of the speech of students in elementary and secondary schools and colleges and universities, whose speech is so severely divergent as to cause academic failure.
3. Both types of study open the way for further investigations of language variation descriptions of sociolinguistic phenomena.

Broz, James, Jr. and Alfred S. Hayes. Linguistics and Reading, A Selective Annotated Bibliography for Teachers of Reading. Washington D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics. 1966.

The materials, compiled by the Center for Applied Linguistics are listed chronologically in three groups.

D.1. Part I - 1942-66. General references reflecting the thinking of linguists about language, its development and growth in the child, and relationships between speech, print, and the reading process.
2. Part II - 1960-66. References dealing with special language problems of speakers of Non-Standard varieties of English.
3. Part III - 1945-65. A limited number of references to the special English language problems of speakers of other languages.

Bruner, Jerome S. Toward a Theory of Instruction. Cambridge Mass., Belknap Press. 1966.

Bryant, Margaret M. Current American Usage. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1962.

Research and Reference.

A. Supported points concern various word, phrase, and sentence usages in Standard and Non-Standard English speech.

Bryden, James D. An acoustic and social dialect analysis of perceptual variables in listener identification and rating of Negro speakers. Final Report. Report #BR-7-C-003. OEG-1-7-070003-3862. 1968.

The purpose of the study was to specify variables which function significantly in racial identification and speech quality rating of Negro and white speakers by Negro and white listeners.

A.1. Ninety-one adults served as subjects; 43 Negro and 43 white subjects provided the listener responses.
2. Subjects chosen were representative of the distribution of socio-economic status scores in the southeastern United States.
3. Listeners were asked to identify the race of each speaker and make a speech quality rating.
4. The Articulatory Product score developed by Guttman was used as an independent, semi-objective index of speech proficiency.
5. All speakers used in analysis had been correctly identified by listeners as to race 95 percent of the time.
6. Results -
    a. Number of phonetic distortions by speakers predicts racial identification.
    b. Socio-economic status score and Articulatory Product score predict speech quality rating of speakers.
    c. On a spectrographic analysis carried out with 10 Negro male and 10 white male subjects, Negro speakers had greater attenuation of format amplitudes (u) vowel than white speakers.

Burke, Eleanor and Others. Curriculum Guide for Child Development Centers, Five Year Old Program. Gallup, New Mexico. Gallup-McKinley County Schools. 1967.

Gallup-McKinley County Schools in New Mexico developed this guide to aid teachers involved in teaching English as a second language to Spanish speaking students and students of Indian descent.

D.1. Guide provides a brief description of value systems of the three ethnic groups--Apanish American, Zuni, and Navaho.
2. A phonetic analysis of the likenesses and differences between English and languages of the three groups is also presented.
3. Objectives and activities for the five year old child are given in the areas of language development, social studies, numbers, physical education, health, science, music, and art.

Butler, Annie L. Will Head Start Be A False Start? In Harry L. Miller (Ed.) Education for the Disadvantaged: Current Issues and Research, New York: The Free Press, 1967, pp. 144-45.

Children in kindergarten should have many opportunities to use language spontaneously.

1. They should be read to, talked to, and subtly encouraged to talk about toys, events, books or pictures.
2. Children are stimulated to talk when they have something to talk about; therefore, first-hand experiences and trips are important in facilitating language growth.
3. Children must be given freedom to talk. It is inconsistent to encourage language development while demanding that children be quiet most of the day.

Butler, Donna and Bernard O'Donnell (Eds.) A guide to available Project English materials. Champaign, Illinois, National Council of Teachers of English. 1968.

This guide is a collection of abstracts--most of them selected from English Curriculum Study and Demonstration Centers of the USOE English Program (Project English).

D.1. Arranged by Center and indexed by subject, the abstracts represent curriculum guides research reports, textbooks and other products for kindergarten through grade 12.
2. Some of the materials are directed toward specific grade levels and are concerned with teaching English as a second language, teaching the disadvantaged, and English teacher preparation.

Byrne, Margaret C. Head Start Evaluation and Research Center, University of Kansas, Report No. III. Effects of a Language Program on Children in a Head Start Nursery. 1967.

A compensatory language program was administered to 13 culturally disadvantaged children. 12 other children were used as a control group.

1. The ages of the children ranged from 3 years, 3 months to

5 years, 10 months.
2. The language program required the children to describe things, listen to the language models of the teacher, and imitate those models.
3. Pre-tests administered at the beginning of the 5-month program were:
   a. The Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA)
   b. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT)
   c. The Irwin Articulation Test.
4. Post-test scores on the ITPA and PPVT did not differ significantly except on two sub-tests of the ITPA, both of which tested grammar skills.
5. It was concluded that the language program did produce some gain in the language ability of the experimental group.

Carpenter, Francis A. A Study of the Reading Achievement of Negro Head Start First-grade Students Compared with Non-Head-Start First-grade Students, dissertation, the Florida State University, 1967. University Microfilms (Order No. 68-340), Ann Arbor, Mich. 48106, 87 pages, microfilm $3.00, xerography $4.60.

A comparison of the reading achievement of disadvantaged first-grade Negro students who had participated in an eight-week Head Start program with those who did not.

1. No difference in reading achievement when students were grouped by comparable reading readiness scores.
2. No important differences in reading achievement scores between
   a. experimental males and females.
   b. experimental and control females.
   c. experimental and control males.
3. Significant difference in the reading achievement means of experimental males who were six years of age and those who were not six when they began first grade.
4. Results show that our eight-week long program was not long enough to prepare disadvantaged Negro children for first-grade reading.

Carroll, William S. and Irwin Feigenbaum. Teaching a second dialect and some implications for TESOL. TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 1, No. 3. 1967.

The research described is being carried out by the Urban Language Study of the Center for Applied Linguistics. The principal task of the project is to study the speech of Negro children in a low socio-economic area in the District of Columbia.

B.1. A basic assumption of the Urban Language Study is that the Non-Standard Negro dialect differs systematically from Standard American English in grammatical structure, as well as in phonology and lexicon.
2. No 'very complete or definite statements' have as yet been made about the Negro dialect verb system, however, enough data has been analyzed to indicate particular problem areas.
3. The materials being developed and used in experimental classes in Washington, D.C. are designed to to replace the 'informal, Non-Standard variety of English', but to teach the students to control an additional variety--a Standard dialect.

Carter, John L. The long range effects of a language stimulation program upon Negro educationally disadvantaged children. Report #BR 6-8390. Houston University, Texas, 1967.

An experimental and control group of 32 pupils were matched on standardized pre-test batteries which determined their language and mental ages.

A.1. The experimental group (E) received the first 40 lessons in the Peabody Language Development Kit whereas the control group (C) had no special treatment but participated in the testing program.
2. Immediate post-testing with the pre-test evaluation battery showed 'very' significant gains by the E group in I.Q., mental age and language age.
3. When the subjects were re-evaluated 20 months after the end of the treatment, the E group had maintained its gains, although the absolute difference between groups diminished somewhat on language age scores.
4. The findings imply that the cumulative defect found among deprived children is not immutable and that early stimulation programs can reverse the downward trends in their language and mental abilities.

Cawley, John. An assessment of intelligence, psycholinguistic abilities and learning aptitudes among pre-school children. OEO-1336. Connecticut University, 1966.

This study was designed to investigate the nature and degree of change in the performance of four year old children before and after a pre-school training program.

1. 150 subjects were enrolled in a year long pre-school program and were given a battery of tests at the beginning and end of the term.
2. The tests used were:
   a. The Stanford-Binet, L-M, 1960 Revision.
   b. The Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities
   c. The Detroit Tests of Learning Aptitude,
3. The results indicated that the children's I.Q. scores, psycholinguistic abilities, and learning aptitudes improved.
4. No control group was used, however, it was concluded that Head Start does help those children in need of a head start.

Cazden, Courtney B. Subcultural differences in child language - an interdisciplinary review. Report #BR-5-0215-25. Contract OEC-5-10-239. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, Vol. 12, No. 3. 1966.

The author evaluated research in linguistics, developmental psychology, sociology, and anthropology done with children of different social classes and minority groups to determine whether or not the language of any group can be considered deficient by use of criteria.

B.1. Both social and psychological criteria on the deficiency of Non-Standard English exists.
2. Mediational variables such as social class affect language

development.
3. Phonology and sentence structure may obscure such mediators as the non-verbal context (affective quality and whether the child talks to adults or children).
4. Author suggested a child's language development be evaluated for progress toward the norms of his particular speech community.
5. The importance of interindividual and intraindividual modes of communication to studies of subcultural differences in language was stressed.

Cazden, Courtney B. Some implications of research on language development for pre-school education. Paper. Conference Social Science Research Council on Pre-school Education. Chicago. 1966.

Research findings and recommendations for pre-school teaching were made.

D.1. Headings are as follows:
  a. The acquisition of grammar, structure of language.
  b. The acquisition of vocabulary.
  c. The acquisition of multiple functions of language.
  d. The acquisition of a standard dialect.
  e. The relation of language to non-verbal behavior.
  f. Beginning reading.
  g. Elementary education.

B.2. The disadvantaged child may be helped most in language development by enlarging his linguistic repertoire rather than by trying to correct his non-standard form.

C.3. Need for elementary school programs to provide reinforcement for the innovations of pre-school programs was emphasized.

Center for Applied Linguistics. Current social dialect research at American Higher Institutions. Report #2. Washington D.C. Center for Applied Linguistics. 1966.

Report number 2 of the Clearinghouse for Social Dialect Studies gives brief descriptions of 26 current, projected, or recently completed social dialect studies.

D.1. Emphasis is on speech of speakers of non-standard varieties of English and associated school problems.
2. Objectives and procedures of each project are described.
3. Most of the programs are school based, but some are under government programs like Project Head Start and Project Literacy.

Chall, Jeanne. Learning to Read, The Great Debate. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Cline, Marion. Improving the Language Arts of Bilinguals Through Audio-visual Means. Las Vegas: Department of Education, New Mexico Highlands University, 1962.

Experiment and Research

A Supported points are 1) same educational procedure for monolingual English speakers and bilingual English speakers proved deficient for the bilinguals; 2) audio-visual techniques may be used to improve the education of bilinguals.

C. Recommendations are: 1) further research is needed.

Cheyney, Arnold B. Teaching culturally disadvantaged in the elementary school. Columbus Ohio. Charles E. Merrill. 1967.

Teaching practices which capitalize on the seemingly inherent high degree of physical involvement of the disadvantaged child have met with much success.

B.1. The child's lack of facility in oral expression is caused primarily by an inadequate vocabulary.
2. Educational games, plays which call for imagination and emphasize correct speech patterns, and classroom activities emphasizing reading and listening skills are highly recommended.
3. Writing activities are best motivated through personal experiences.

D.4. Games, instructions for making audio-visual aids, and bibliographies of resources are provided throughout the document

Cockrell, Wilma and Johnson, Kenneth R. Standard Oral English, Instructional Guide C. Report #LACS-Pub.-ESEA-3-4. Los Angeles City Schools, Division of Secondary Education, July, 1969.

D. This guide (developed with ESEA Title 1 funds) outlines an oral English program to help Negro students eliminate non-standard pronunciation and usage in their speech. The first part consists of three lessons to motivate the students, which develop particular concepts about language. The second and third parts contain pronunciation and usage lessons which deal with one item of linguistic interference and give the student an opportunity to use Standard English in a particular situation.

Each lesson has three or four follow-up activities, which are designed as 10 or 15 minutes activities to be presented following the basic lessons. The guide also contains an outline of the characteristics of Negro dialects, general teaching suggestions, and a brief bibliography.

Cohen, Dorothy H. Effect of a special program in literature on the vocabulary and reading achievement of second grade children in special service schools. Report #CRP-S-254 and BR-5-8034. New York University. 1966.

580 second-grade children from seven elementary schools in New York City were administered the Free Association Vocabulary Test and the Metropolitan Reading Achievement Test, Upper Primary, Grade 2.

A.1. Experimental and control classes were set up on a random basis.
2. Teachers read a story daily to the experimental classes. Stories were accompanied by follow up activities designed to enhance comprehension.
3. Stories were read to the control classes as an occasional treat and followed no specified pattern.
4. Findings -

Analyses of covariance led to the conclusion that oral language correlates with reading, and both can be improved by regular exposure to stories read aloud.

C. One of the implications of the research is that teachers must be familiar with children's literature suitable to the age and development of the children they are teaching.

Cohen, S. Alan. Some conclusions about teaching reading to socially disadvantaged children and youth. Paper. New York State English Teachers Council (Kiamesha Lake, 1966).

Based on 'cold data', the following conclusions about the problems of teaching reading to socially disadvantaged children are listed:

B.1. Although most of these children are retarded readers, they learn to read in spite of their psychological problems.
2. These children tend to be visual rather than auditory readers.
3. Teachers are not familiar with new and appropriate materials and methods for teaching these children.

C.1. Word attack skills including phonics should be part of the remedial reading instructional program.
2. Linguistic-phonic instruction should be given as early as beginning reading programs.
3. The rate of their learning should be adjusted to meet their individual needs.

Cohen, Werner. On the language of lower-class children. School Review, 1959, 67, pp. 435-40.

B. Hypothetical points are 1) English dialects and Non-Standard English are commonly felt to be inferior to Standard English. 2) English dialects and Non-Standard English are quite valid means of communication within the proper social context.

C. Recommendations are 1) the English teacher must come to know and respect the language of his students. 2) Not only the educational system but the whole social structure must work toward objectification of and respect for lower-class language usages.

Connecticut State Department of Education. Supplementary Language Arts Center in Danbury. Report #CSDE-Bull-105, 1968.

This bulletin describes the Demonstration City Project in Danbury, Connecticut, a model school system designed to research and develop federally-funded programs.

D.1. Central to the project's goal of turning potential into accomplishment and bringing children up to grade level, was the idea that language arts is more than reading alone.
2. Speaking, writing and listening skills were included in the planned curriculum.
3. Teacher impressions and ideas resulting from the project are listed.

Corbin, Richard. Literacy, literature, and the disadvantaged. In Language Programs for the Disadvantaged. Champaign, Illinois. NCTE, 1965.

Research basis.

A. Supported points are 1)speaking, listening and reading are interdependent skills. 2) over 1/2 of the disadvantaged are Negro. 3) most 'slow learners' are disadvantaged youth who don't fare will in the ethnocentric school evaluation system and who fall further and further behind their WASP counterparts. 4) most texts and methods of English teaching have little relevancy to the life of the disadvantaged youth and there is little consequent motivation for his wanting to learn Standard English.

C. Recommendations are: de-ethnocentricization of teacher attitudes, texts, materials, and methods of teaching for the disadvantaged.

Cowling, Dorothy N.C. Language Ability and Readiness for School of Children Who Participated in Head Start Programs. A Dissertaion Abstract. Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa. 1967.

To test language ability and school readiness in children with Head Start experience, 168 disadvantaged children were randomly selected.

1. All children (half had Head Start experience) received the Metropolitan Readiness Test and were observed by their teacher and examiner.
2. Results -
   a. In language ability, the Head Start children were significantly better able to be understood by their teachers and the examiner, to respond to their peers' questions and to retell a simple story.
   b. In school readiness as measured by the Metropolitan Readiness Test, Head Start children were significantly more ready for school.
   c. Head Start children ranked significantly higher in participating in voluntary discussions, showing respect for each other, feeling at ease with their peers, feeling self-confident in school, asking questions about unclear directions, and telling personal experiences to the examiner.
   d. Head Start children showed only a tendency to feel the need to conform to regulations.

Craig, Myrtle C. Reading and writing Standard English. Paper. Conference, National Council of Teachers of English. Honolulu, 1967.

The value of oral language as a means of attaining reading and writing proficiency is suggested.

Success in these areas can be attained if

B.1. the home language of the child is accepted,
2. the child is offered materials on his level of understanding as well as on his level of speech,
3. the child's writing is accepted on the basis of successful communication rather than on the basis of mechanics,
4. the child is immersed in oral speech,
5. the thought process in speech is explained to him as thought-action and writing as after-thought.

Currie, Haver C. A project in sociolinguistics: the relationship of speech ot social status. Southern Speech Journal, 18, 1952.

Research based.

A. Supported points are 1) there are notable aspects of language which differ among social classes.

B. Hypothetical points are 1)analysis of language may be used as a measure of social status; 2) leveling social differences entails leveling dialect differences.

C. Recommendations are 1)spoken English needs to be further researched.

Cutis, Warren G. Reading unreadiness in the underprivileged. NEA Journal, 52, 1963.

B. Hypothetical points are 1) many underprivileged children speak something other than Standard EHglish.

C. Recommendations are 1)teachers should approach the teaching of English to the disadvantaged as though it were a foreign language; 2) teachers need to accept the notion of a proper language for a proper situation and thus respect the child's language as a proper means of communication in the proper situation; 3) school programs for the culturally deprived should include cultural orientation.

Dailey, John T. and Clinto A. Meyman Jr. An Evaluation of the Language Arts Program of the District of Columbia. Final Report. District of Columbia Public School, Washington D.C., 1965.

In an evaluation of a program for oral and written facility and comprehension among children of an urban culture, 262 children in kindergarten comprised the experimental groups and 369 students served as controls.

A.1. Children in both groups were presented with three pictures and instructed to tell a story about each.
 2. Observers reated speech facility and overall verbalization. Pre-tests and post-tests were given to both groups.
 3. Findings -
  a. Students in experimental schools do significantly better in word meaning, language facility, picture vocabulary, and the Merrill-Palmer Scale and relatively better on English Error Score and in reading than their readiness score predicted.
  b. They made significantly fewer errors on the Dailey Language Facility Test.
  c. When school characteristics and school success were compared with data from another study, it was found that teachers' salaries, teachers' experience, number of books in the library and per-pupil expenditure are more closely related to school success than are school size, class size, age of building and suburban location. Family income was most closely related.

C. The program was found to be needed and successful and should be extended to the pre-kindergarten level.

Daniel, Artie A. and Douglas E. Giles. A comparison of the oral language development of Head Start pupils with non-Head Start pupils. 1966.

The investigation developed and administered a measurement of various aspects of oral language to determine if disadvantaged children, participating in intervention programs, exhibit superior language development several months after such participation.

1. There were 52 subjects in each group.
2. Findings showed that -
   a. Project Head Start participants displayed greater oral language development than non-Head Start pupils.
   b. Head Start activities were more effective in encouraging the oral language development of low-intelligence pupils than high-intelligence pupils.
3. Recommendations were made for materials and activities to be included in Head Start curriculums.

Davis, A.L. Dialect research and the needs of the schools. Elementary English, 45, May 1968.

The enormous amount of language research now in progress is especially pertinent for an understanding of the present urban situation with its millions of immigrants from other dialect areas.

A. Typical of the research being conducted in major American cities is the Chicago survey in which ATLAS questionnaires were distributed to sample the Negro and white population including native born and in-migrant, lower and middle class.
   a. The native-born middle class Negro and white speakers were shown to be relatively close together in their speech.
   b. Native born lower class whites show a great midland influence.
   c. The recent arrivals, such as whites from Appalachia and Negroes from the interior South, have the speech characteristics of their native state.

B.1. According to Professor Beryl Bailey, the speech of some Negroes may be likened to a foreign language; therefore foreign language teaching techniques may be appropriate. Aural understanding precedes oral practice, and both come before reading and writing.

2. Most speakers use a variety of speech styles and shift automatically to whatever is most appropriate to the social situation. Language behavior is too complex to be reduced to simple single standards which would treat incorrectness as mortal sin.

C.1. More research is needed in the area of non-verbal communication so that we might better understand how speakers from dialect areas other than our own may modify their messages and how this can result in misinterpretation of their intentions.

2. Much of the current effort in urban dialectology focuses upon Negro speech, however, hillbilly, Spanish-American, American Indian and Hawaiian Pidgin dialects must be researched in studying minority linguistic styles.

Day, David E. The effects of different langauge instruction on the use of attributes of pre-kindergarten disadvantaged children. Paper. Annual Meeting, American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, 1968.

This 10-month study was conducted to compare the effectiveness of (1) a highly structured teaching plan for language instruction and (2) a developmental, flexible instructional approach in correcting language deficiencies.

A.1. Near the end of the 10-month program, the children of both groups were asked to describe several objects. These descriptions make up the data that was submitted to an analysis by 2 judges using a modification of Siegel's system for organizing language grouping preference behavior.

2. The judges independently grouped the children's descriptions into 4 categories (there was 90% agreement between the judges on the classifications).
   - a. Category 1, Total Language Production, showed no significant difference between the 2 groups.
   - b. Category 2, The Use of Relational-Contextual Words, showed that the developmental group described objects by function more than did the structured group.
   - c. Category 3, Conceptual Responses, indicated no significant difference between groups.
   - d. Category 4, Use of Descriptive Part-Whole Words, showed that the structured group used color and form descriptions more than did the developmental group.

3. It was concluded that overall the structured group was more adapt at using language with clarity and specificity.

Dehnke, Ronald E. Not by the Book. Statement, Vol. 3, March 1968.

Rather than teaching prescriptive grammar or linguistics, the English teacher should guide the student into an inquiry about the nature of language.

B.1. Language usage is determined by the social situation and many students need to be, in effect, bilingual, able to speak the English of the home and another type at school.

C.2. Students should be encouraged to ask questions about the nature of language differences, varieties of language situations, uses of languages, and ways that 'correctness' in language is determined.
Such questioning encourages students to be independent thinkers and affords them opportunities to use language and thus become more skillful with it.

De Matos, F. Gomes. Review of Language, Linguistics and School Programs. Proceedings of the 1963 Spring Institutes of the NCTE. Linguistics, 25, 1966.

Review.

B. Hypothetical points are 1) '... in no area of the English curriculum is the gap between research and the glassroom greater than in the study of the English language.'

C. Recommandations are 1) students need a saner, more objective approach to language; 2) teaching must be done with an incorporation of respect for the children's language and culture; 3) linguistics can be useful in the teaching of sentence structure for composition; 4) there is a definite need for more realistic teacher training in terms of real issues.

Deutsch, Cynthia P. Socio-cultural influences and learning channels. Paper. International Reading Association Conference. 1967.

The hypothesis that environmental circumstances influence the process of knowledge acquisition is discussed.

A.1. The role of partial and full sensory isolation and deprivation and its negative effect on learning is shown to be supported by research.
2. The auditory mode of learning for lower-class children seems to be less efficient than the visual mode.

Deutsch, Martin. The disadvantaged child and the learning process, in Passow, H. (Ed.) Education in Depressed Areas. New York, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

The lower class child comes to school with few of the skills necessary to meet school demands.

B.1. The child may be deficient in the ability to use adults as sources of information.
2. In the non-verbal slum home, the child may fail to acquire a language concept system and factual knowledge about himself.
3. Research suggests that early intervention in language areas, perhaps preceded by an emphasis on perceptual training, can facilitate the transition from home to school.

Deutsch, M.P. The Role of Social Class in Language Development and Cognition. Paper. Ortho-psychological Association Meeting, 1964.

Diebold, A. Richard Jr. The consequences of early bilingualism in cognitive development and personality formation. 1966.

This paper reviews the advances made by interdisciplinary linguistic research into the effects of early bilingualism.

1. The more typical bilingual situation is one in which one of the languages is dominant and in which the social functions of the two languages are different.
2. When bilinguals are studied in contexts where their bilingual background does not automatically assign them a lower status, it can be shown 'that bilingualism is associated with and may in fact be facilitative of superior performances on both verbal and non-verbal intelligence tests.'
3. Cases of bilingual psychopathology can be traced to a 'crisis in social and personal identity engendered by antagonistic acculturative pressures...'

Dillard, J.L. Negro children's dialect in the inner city. Florida FL Reporter, Fall 1967.

Recent research on the nature of non-standard English dialects has indicated that certain archaic speech forms associated with Creole languages are preserved in the speech of urban Negro children.

B.1. The Negro child must learn to read in Standard English, a dialect he cannot speak, and is taught by a teacher who usually does not recognize how different the student's language really is from the English of his textbook.
  2. Further study into the relationship between the history of the English language in America and the structure of the Negro Non-Standard dialect will not only reveal historical data but will probably change the way Standard English is taught to speakers of Non-Standard dialects.
C. Language programs for these children should be based on a more complete linguistic analysis of their language acquisition patterns.

Duggins, James H. Reading and social difference. English Journal, 54, 1965.

Experience-based.

B. Supported points are 1)socially different groups speak differently; 2) teachers are usually too ethnocentric in their approach to language and link good Standard English with moral good; 3) reading materials are often not meaningful to the socially different students; 4) lack of privacy at school or home.
C. Recommendations are 1) de-ethnocentricization of the teacher; 2) a private place (carrell or booth) for the student to study; 3) materials geared to the life experiences of the student; 4) the oral-aural approach to teaching Standard American English.

Dunn, Lloyd M. and others. The effectiviness of three reading approaches and an oral language stimulation program with disadvantaged children in the primary grades--an interim report after one year of the Cooperative Reading Project. Report #IMRID-BSM-7. Geo. Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn. 1967.

The three experimental treatments were 1) the Initial Teaching Alphabet (ITAP, 2) The Words in Color (WIC), and 3) A Supplemented Conventional Reading Program (SCRP) using a basic reader plus additional phonics material.

A.1. Subjects were 608 first grade pupils from schools in an inner city area.
  2. Some experimental classes received an oral stimulation program utilizing level one of the Peabody Language Development Kits (PLDK).
  3. There were 9 experimental groups and 1 control group.
  4. Pre-tests and post-test.
  5. Analysis of variance, orthogonal comparisons, and T-tests were used to analyze the data.
  6. Results -

  - a. PLDK enhanced performance of children in intellectual growth and oral language, but not in school achievement.
  - b. Combination of ITA and PLDK was less effective than the other treatments.
  - c. SCRP experimental treatment was superior at the .01 level to WIC and ITA, with girls superior to boys in all cases.

Dunn, Lloyd and others. The efficacy of the Initial Teaching Alphabet and the Peabody Language Development Kit with disadvantaged children in the primary grades--an interim report after two years. Report #IMRID-P/R-4-7. Geo Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn. 1967.

An interim report of the effectiveness of the ITA and PLDK with underprivileged children in beginning reading and in stimulating oral language and verbal intelligence is presented.

A.1. Five experimental groups and one control group were derived from nine schools.
  2. Experimental groups had various combinations of ITA, PLDK and conventional reading and various lengths of PLDK treatment, while the control group had nothing but conventional reading.
  3. The results -
    - a. ITA groups were significantly advanced in reading achievement over the conventional reading group.
    - b. Children with ITA and 2 years PLDK made more reading progress than any other group.
    - c. Children with 1 or 2 years PLDK made greater language gains than those without PLDK. Two years PLDK gives greater language gains than one year PLDK.
    - d. Growth in intellectual development was enhanced in terms of MA not I.Q.
  4. While use of ITA made greater effects than conventional reading with or without PLDK, the combined ITA and 2 years of PLDK was most effective with underprivileged children.

Dworking, Anthony Gary. No Siesta Manana, in Mack, Ray W. Our Children's Burden. New York, Random House, 1968.

This article points out some of the social strains existing in the schools and community which contribute to present deficiencies in Mexican-American education.
After a brief historial sketch and demographic description of Mexican-Americans in Los Angeles, the author makes the following points concerning Mexican-American education:

B.1. The educational level of the Mexican-American in the ghetto is lower than in the more disadvantaged ghetto of Watts because the Mexican value system is more at odds with the school system than is that of the Negro.
  - a. The Mexican-American thinks of himself as a member of *LaRaza* - Mexican concept which carries the idea of splendid and glorious destiny.
  - b. Another important component of Mexican culture is *machismo*; the cult of masculinity. Having its roots in the Catholic Church, *machismo* stresses a patriarchal and authoritarian family structure.
  - c. The Anglo-Saxon family is child centered while the Mexican

family is family centered.

d. The school is viewed as a source of Anglo-Saxon authority and as a threat to the preservation of Mexican-American culture.

e. Mexican-Americans view Spanish as an important link with their native country and as a symbol of loyalty to LaRaza.

f. While scoring poorly on traditional verbal oriented I.Q. tests, Mexican-American children score above average on culture free tests in areas such as manual dexterity.

g. In many ghetto schools, the teachers do not speak Spanish and the Mexican-Americans do not speak English in the early grades, thereby intensifying the educational problem.

h. There are few Mexican-American teachers because teaching is viewed as a feminine profession and the Mexican woman's place is in the home.

i. Counselors in Mexican-American schools have constantly encouraged manual training and de-emphasized intellectual topics.

C. Many changes are required to improve Mexican-American education.

a. Special efforts should be made to recruit male Mexican-Americans into the teaching profession.

b. Spanish could be required for certification of teachers who will be teaching in the Mexican-American ghetto.

c. Pre-kindergarten Mexican children should receive instruction in English so that they may compete effectively with other children.

d. The schools should encourage parental involvement in school activities.

D. The Mexican-American of today has great determination to obtain the equality which is rightfully his. To this end, he continuously strives.

Ecroyd, Donald H. Negro children and language arts. The Reading Teacher. Vol. 21, No. 7, 1968.

The language the Negro child brings to school has a linguistic structure which is clearly distinguishable from that of Standard English.

A.1. His language is not a defective form of speech.

2. A mutual lack of comprehension exists on the part of the teacher and of the child for the other's language system

C.3. Necessary to involve the child in a series of experiences that develop his oral language competence.

4. The Negro ghetto child must develop conceptual language symbols such as 'up-down' and 'big-bigger'. The usual reading materials should be delayed until this is accomplished.

5. The child should learn to read what he says; when this phase is well under way, he can begin to learn to read what the teacher says.

Edwards, Thomas J. Cultural deprivation--ideas for action. Paper. International Reading Association Conference, 1967.

Basic learning deficiencies and psycho-social adjustment needs which handicap the culturally different learner should be recognized and provided for.

C.1. Dialectical barriers could be checked by linguistic immersion or by allowing the learner maximum contact with Standard American English so that he could master vocabulary, pronunciation, syntax, and idiomatic expressions.
2. Levels of aspiration and concept of self could be raised by constantly reassuring the learner of his capacity to learn and by allowing him successes.
3. Knowledge of his experiential background, value system, and linguistic orientation is as significant as a continuous assessment of his strengths, weaknesses, and progress.

Engel, Rose C. and others. Language development experiences for young children. Handbook, University of Southern California. 1966.

A discussion of language development and program planning is followed by explicit language experience activities in various subject areas for pre-school children.

D.1. Each experience is presented on a single page of the manual with lists of materials needed, things to do, things to talk about and variations of the experiences suggested for another day.
2. Included are lists of books for teachers and books for children, along with forms for evaluation of a child's language development and progress.

Entwisle, Doris R. Subcultural Differences in Children's Language Development. Report #BR-6-1610-2. Contract OEG-2-7-061610-0207. Johns Hopkins University. Baltimore Md. 1967.

The linguistic development of children of different socio-economic environments was determined by a study of work associations.

A.1. The relation of residential area, social class, or subcultural group membership to linguistic development was main concern of study. Groups were further categorized according to I.Q. level, sex and grade.
2. Word associations were obtained in response to a list of 96 stimulus words.
3. Each child was interviewed and asked to respond with the first word thought of as the interviewer said a word aloud.
4. Conclusions -
   a. Negligible differences between suburban children from upper middle class and blue collar neighborhoods.
   b. Rural Maryland children tend to develop more slowly than suburban children.
   c. Amish children develop even more slowly than rural Maryland children.
   d. White slum children are advanced compared to suburban children at first grade, but retarded at third grade.
   e. Negro slum children are generally behind white slum children but at first grade the Negro slum children are on a par with white suburban children.

Entwisle, Doris R. Developmental Sociolinguistics - Inner City Children. Report #BR-6-1610-1, Grant OEG-2-7-061610-0207. Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore Md. 1967.

Word associations of Negro and white slum children were studied to determine what impact extreme socio-economic status differences have on language development.

A.1. Data gathered from 541 children in public elementary schools in Baltimore, Maryland.
2. The entire design was replicated four times (Negro interviewer-white children, Negro interviewer-Negro children, white interviewer-white children, white interviewer-Negro children). No child was interviewed more than once.
3. Principal measure of linguistic development was the number of word responses that matched previously determined paradigms such as the response to 'go' is 'run'.
4. Findings -
   a. First grade white slum children were more advanced linguistically than suburban children of similar I.Q.
   b. Although not as advanced as white slum children, Negro first-grade slum children are probably as mature linguistically as white suburban children of the same intelligence level.
   c. Advancement of first-grade slum children disappears by third grade, and they lag behind at ages 8 and over.
   d. Degree of urbanization may strongly affect verbal development.
   e. It was found that more mature responses are made by children when responding to an interviewer of a different race.

Entwisle, Doris and Greenberger, Ellen. Differences in the language of Negro and white grade-school children. 1, 2. Report #BR-6-1610. Grant OEG-2-7-061610-02-07. Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1968.

As reported in 'Developmental Sociolinguistics - Inner City Children' individual interviews were conducted in the slums of Baltimore with white and Negro children and in suburban Baltimore with middle-class and blue collar children.

A.1. Slum children are apparently more advanced linguistically than suburban children at first grade in paradigmatic responses.
2. By third grade, however, the suburban children lead on all paradigmatic measures.

B.3. Differences in word associations presumably reflect differences in semantic structure between white and Negro children which may develop apart from, or in addition to dialect differences, especially in segregated environments.
4. It appears that whereas suburban children are progressing toward expanding their semantic systems over the elementary school years slum children are making little or no progress toward use of language that is conceptually more elaborate.

C.5. Possible remedies -
   a. Some adjunct use of television in the early grades.
   b. Specific training on word associates in the form of oral group games like those feature in Bereiter's language learning activities.

c. Revised primers could be prepared which are based on the actual vocabularies of disadvantaged children.

Fagan, Edward R. (Ed.) English and the disadvantaged. Scranton Penn. International Text Book Co. 1967.

This book is composed of a collection of articles by the staff and participants of an NDEA Summer Institute for disadvantaged youth.

D. Part I contains the following articles:
  a. "English for What" by Charles Weingartner
  b. "English Teaching and Drop-Outs" and "English and the Polylogue" by Robert Graham
  c. "English and Social Survival" by Edward Fagan and William Dallam.
  d. "Learning and Classroom Climate" by John Withall

Part II details the application of these attitudes in the following articles:
  a. "Linguistics and the Disadvantaged" by Clemens Hallman
  b. "Reading and the Disadvantaged" by Antita Dunn
  c. "Composition and the Disadvantaged" by Theodora Graham
  d. "Literature and the Disadvantaged" by Edward Fagan
  e. "Media and the Disadvantaged" by Edward Fagan and Helen Koch.

Fifield, Ruth (comp.) English as a Second Language, Bibliography. El Centro, Calif. Imperial County Education Center. 1968.

The materials in this bibliography are aimed at teachers of English as a second language.

D.1. The materials include:
  a. professional materials
  b. instructional materials
  c. the curriculum resource room
  d. audio-visual materials
  e. Spanish-language curriculum materials.

2. The dates of the approximately 250 documents range from 1946 to 1967.

Filler, Louis. A Dictionary of American Social Reform. New York, Philosophical Library, 1963.

Reference.

D. This book is basically a dictionary or encyclopedia of people, places, concepts, etc. concerned with social Reform.

Finocchiaro, Mary. Bilingual readiness in earliest school years, a curriculum demonstration project. City University of New York, Hunter Collge, Report #CRP-D-107. 1966.

A two year experimental program to develop 'bilingual readiness' was undertaken in kindergarten and first grade classes composed of Negro Spanish-speaking and other children.

C. 1. Everyday for about 15 minutes a teacher bilingual in Spanish and English visited the classrooms and presented specially prepared materials using Spanish about 65 percent of the time.

2. Spanish-speaking children were encouraged to participate as "informants" and to act out stories in Spanish.
3. The curriculum stressed verbal interaction in both languages.
4. The results of the study indicated that there was greater acceptance by the children and their parents of second language learning.
5. The Spanish-speaking children acquired greater self-confidence and cultural awareness.

Ford, Nich Aaron, Improving reading and writing skills of disadvantaged college freshmen. College Composition and Communication, Vol. 18, No. 2, May 1967.

This document is a summary and interpretation of a 3-year experiment which was conducted to determine (1) whether or not specially selected materials, experiences, and methodology can motivate students more thoroughly than does the typical freshman English course, and (2) whether the effectively motivated students will likewise achieve at a higher level in other academic subjects involving these skills. The problem, methodology, major assumptions underlying the methodology, and evaluation techniques are outlined briefly.

Friedlander, George. Report on the articulatory and intelligibility status of socially disadvantaged pre-school children. Report #OEO-536. Institute for Retarded Children of Shield of David. 1965.

This study involved 150 children, 4 1/2 - 6 years of age from Spanish, Negro and white family backgrounds.

A.1. The subjects were tested with the Templin-Darley Diagnostic Test of Articulation. A taped conversation with each child was used for evaluation by an independent group of examiners in the areas of intelligibility, verbal proficiency, foreign accent, regional accent, and articulatory defects.
2. Data indicated that all groups were minimally proficient in intelligibility and verbal performance.
3. White children showed greater articulatory maturity than the Negro and Spanish-language children.

Gardner, R.C. Attitudes and motivation: their role in second language acquisition. Paper, T.E.S.O.L. Convention, 1968.

The author reviews some of the research which he has conducted on the role of the parent in the language-learning situation.

A.1. It is suggested that the observed phenomenon is as relevant to the English as a second language program (ESL) as to any other second-language situation.
2. Attitudinal motivational characteristics of the student are important.
3. The nature of these characteristics suggests that the truly successful student is motivated to become integrated with the other language community.
4. Second language acquisition involves the child both in taking on behavioral characteristics of the other language community, and in experiencing resistance from himself and pressures from his own cultural community.

C.1. The integrative motive must be fostered by an accepting attitude, by the parents, concerning the other language group.

Galvan, Robert R. Bilingualism as it Relates to Intelligence Test Scores. Dissertation, E. Texas University, 1967.

Discussion of the relationship of verbal and non-verbal intelligence tests to school achievement of bilingual culturally deprived children.

A.1. Spanish-American children were subjects of the study.
  2. They scored better on the Welchsler Intelligence Scale for Children when administered in Spanish instead of English.
  3. In several use of achievement tests for determining school achievement not a satisfactory measure of bilingual children.
  4. Results point out that verbal tests of intelligence are inadequate for testing bilingual children.
C.1. Non-verbal tests of intelligence might serve as a better indicator of pupil functioning and possible school success than higher verbal tests.

Garvey, Catherine and Paul T. McFarlane. A preliminary study of Standard English speech patterns in the Baltimore City Public Schools. Report #16 and BR-6-1610-04. Grant OEG-2-7-061610-0207, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore MD. 1968.

Language patterns of fifth graders from four inner-city elementary schools - two white and two Negro - and from one white middle class suburban school were studied.

A.1. The purpose of study -
  a. To identify sub-groups whose language behavior differ systematically from each other and from Standard English.
  b. To gather information on the language repertoires of these sub-groups.
  c. To isolate language patterns that need intensive training.
  2. The children were asked to repeat 60 critical Standard English sentences containing 15 different syntactic or morphological features expected to differ from their normal speech.
  3. The number and types of semantic, grammatical and structural transpositions employed in the 'limitation' were tabulated for analysis.

Gessman, Albert M. Another language - another pattern of thinking. College Language Association Journal, 3, 1960.

B. Hypothetical points are 1) a man is a prisoner of his language 'because it is hard to conceive of ideas for which one's language has no means of verbal expression.'

Golden, Ruth I. Improving Patterns of English Usage. Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 196-.

Research.

A. Supported points are: Non-Standard English varies from Standard English in 1) auxiliary tense structures; 2) agreement of subject and verb; 3) negation.
C. Recommendations are 1) systematic attack on the above problem as are outlined in the book.

Golden, Rugh. Learning Standard English by linguistic methods. ERIC, ED 018 783, October 1968.

The author, who spent a year studying the Non-Standard English of students in Detroit, describes a series of tapes designed to help children from impoverished backgrounds develop verbal facility.

A.1. The sooner the child learns to distinguish the sounds of the home and neighborhood from those of the school and business world, and has practice in using the new sounds, the better start he will have in all communication skills.
2. Tapes were discussed and revised by a multi-racial team of teachers and supervisors as well as consulting linguists and educators.
3. 3 elementary schools in Detroit used the tapes for 12 weeks. Control groups were taught 'speech improvement' according to traditional methods.
4. Results -
   a. Scores showed a .05 level of confidence in favor of the experimental groups.
   b. No other factor (sex, education of parents, school building or mental abilities) showed statistical significance.
   c. According to a personality test on 'Anxiety Scale' no evidence of increased anxiety due to the tapes was shown.

Golden, Rugh I. and Martellock, Helen A. Teaching Standard English to Urban primary children. Final Report #BR-5-0368. Detroit Public Schools, Michigan, 1967.

The purpose of this study was to test the effectiveness of tape-recorded responsive lessons to help urban primary children develop a Standard English dialect.

A.1. An experimental group of 36 children heard and recited 8 to 10 minute tapes of poems, songs, and speech games, while 36 children in a control group were instructed in Standard English by more traditional methods.
2. Each child was given a taped interview at the beginning and end of the school year.
3. Deviations from standard dialect were counted and tabulated by impartial speech correctionists.
4. Results -
   a. The experimental groups improvement in the use of Standard English over that of the control group was significant at the .05 level.
   b. The difference could not be ascribed to sex, educational structures of the three participating schools, or the mental abilities of the children.

Goldstein, Miriam. The Teaching of Language in Our Schools: A MacMillan Guidebook for Parents. London, MacMillan. 1966.

This book describes for parents the effects that recent developments in language study have had on the English curriculum.

Discussion covers:

D.1. literacy (language development in small children, spelling,

reading, writing, and bilingualism),
2. grammar (structural linguistics, transformational grammar, and the new textbooks),
3. usage (dictionaries, lexicography, linguistic geography, and the history of the language),
4. courses of study in English, including examples from selected schools.

Available from: National Council of Teachers of English, 508 S. Sixth Street, Champaign, Illinois 61820.

Gomberg, Adeline. The Lighthouse Day Camp Reading Experiment with Disadvantaged Children. Reading Teacher, Vol. 19, No. 252, 1966.

The program conducted by the Lighthouse, a settlement house in north Philadelphia was described and assessed.

A.1. Purpose of program -
  a. To boost the opportunities in reading readiness for children about to enter first grade.
  b. To enrich language experiences.
  c. To give remedial help to children with reading deficiencies.
2. The campers met 4 days a week for 6 weeks.
3. Daily schedule included reading and language development activities.
4. Findings -
  a. Consistent gains in general oral language development and reading readiness.
  b. No marked changes in word recognition or hearing comprehension.
  c. Program was especially helpful to language development with younger groups.

Gonzales, Eugene and John Plakos. Bilingual education for Mexican-American children, a report of an experiment conducted in the Marysville Joint Unified School District, Calif.

An experimental class in bicultural and bilingual education was conducted on an upgraded basis.

C.1. 19 pupils whose ages ranged from 6 to 10 years and whose grade placements ordinarily would have been from kindergarten to grade 4 were the subjects. Twelve spoke Spanish and English and 6 spoke and understood only Spanish.
2. Content areas in arithmetic, history, geography, and science were adapted in Spanish to promote acquisition of necessary concepts, as the pupils used their language to mediate learning.
3. Although parents, teachers, and students seem very positive in their attitudes toward a bilingual program and many students did experience success conclusive evidence of the effectiveness is not available because of a control group not being utilized.

Gotkin, Lassar G. Games and other activities for developing language skills. N.Y., New York University, Institute for Developmental Studies, 1968.

The author has developed several ways to use effectively games and mechanical devices to teach language skills to pre-school and kindergarten children.

C.1. The matrix game -
   a. a set of pictures in columns and rows, which functions on the principles and methods of programmed instruction.
   b. requires the child to discriminate symbols, pictures, and colours and to verbalize his answer.
2. The telephone interview induces the child to structure conversations as the teacher gives him thematic prompts over the telephone.
3. The language master (tape recorder and moving card holder)
   a. Used to make the child verbalize after he has been aurally and visually stimulated.
   b. Provides the child with immediate feedback.
4. the alphabet board
   a. A board grooved with the shape of the letters of the alphabet into which the latters are placed, much as in a puzzle.
   b. Device helps disadvantaged children, especially, to learn to discriminate the shapes and names of letters and to realize that letters are a code for the spoken language.
5. All methods are designed as supplementary tools.

Gotkin, Lassar G. Programmed instruction as a strategy for developing curricula for children from disadvantaged backgrounds. New York, New York University, School of Education, 1967.

Matrix games is a modified programmed instruction approach to teaching and developing language skills.

C.1. The procedure used indicates the child's cognitive and articulation abilities so that difficulties in these two areas can be discovered and corrected.
2. Matrix games includes within its instructional framework the important principles of textbook and machine-type programming, namely:
   a. Clear specification of instructional objectives.
   b. Careful sequencing of steps.
   c. Use of small sequencing steps.
   d. Substantial active participation by the student.
   e. Confirmation of the correctness of the student's response.

Gott, Evelyn. Teaching regional dialects in junior high school. English Journal, 53, 1964.

Linguistics in teaching.

B. Hypothetical points are 1) teaching in dialects makes students aware of correctness and acceptability; 2) students thus acquire a tolerance for and understanding of forms of their own language and the language of others.

C. Recommendations are 1) the teaching of regional dialects in public schools.

Gove, Philip B. A perspective on usage. Language, Linguistics and School Programs, Proceedings, Spring Institutes, Champaign, Ill. N.C.T.E., 1963.

The author states that Standard English is that which is 'widely recognized as acceptable' and sub-Standard English refers to those words and phrases not incorrect in themselves but not used by the prestige group in a community.

C. Students should understand that English takes its form not from authoritative rules but from being -
  a. Appropriate to the subject.
  b. Valid in relation to contemporary usage.
  c. Comfortable for both speaker and listener.
  Such usage includes colloquial English.

Gray, William S. The Teaching of Reading and Writing. Chicago; UNESCO and Scott Foresman and Company, 1956.

Research based textbook.

A. Supported points are: 1) literacy problems vary in nature from area to area; 2) each area must attack its illiteracy problems with a program geared to those problems in particular; 3) there is a conspicuous lack of informed leaders for literacy programs.

C. Recommendations are 1) a systematic awareness of an attack on the above problems.

Green, Robert L. Intellectual development among economically and educationally disadvantaged youth. Paper, Detroit School Administrators Workshop, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1966.

The economically and educationally disadvantaged youth experiences and environment which lacks stimuli essential to positive intellectual growth and achievement.

B.1. The disadvantaged youth is not exposed by his family to educational materials, travel experiences, or standard language patterns which would facilitate his verbal ability or general academic readiness.
  2. The physically and academically sub-standard schools which the disadvantaged youth attends cause an actual decline in students' measured intelligence and achievement as they grow older.

C.1. The schools must be made largely responsible for providing an environment which would stimulate the potential for intellectual growth.

Greenberg, Norman C. and Greenberg, Gilda M. Education of the American Indian in today's world, an interdisciplinary approach for teachers and administrators. William C. Brown Book Co., Dubuque, Iowa, 1964.

A concise overview of American Indian education is presented. Included are an historical background, a presentation of cultural practices and value systems, an explanation of Southwestern Indian speech sounds and a description of the education of Indians.

C. According to the authors, a knowledge of Indian environment, values, and customs is needed to provide effective Indian education, and an education program for Indian adults is an absolute necessity.

Greenfield, Patricia M. Oral or written language--the consequences for cognitive development in Africa and the United States. Paper, AERA, Chicago, 1968.

The author states that language use rather than language structure determines cognitive development.

A.1. In oral cultures, education is accomplished by the child's learning to imitate, using concrete objects in concrete activities.
2. In a written language culture, abstract thinking is encouraged with emphasis on the ability to generalize and to manipulate symbols.
3. In experiments with the Wolof children in Senegal it was found that although the children were taught in French, they changed their use of Wolof in a concept-formation situation so that in functional terms Wolof became more 'written'.
4. United States Negro lower class children have been found to have the same object context orientation found in oral cultures and have similarly improved in abstract thinking ability when given training.

Gumperz, John J. Types of linguistic communities. Anthropological Linguistics. 4, (1), 1962.

C. Hypothetical points are 1) '... from the point of view of social functions, the distinction between bilingualism and bidialect is often not a significant one.' 2) 'It almost seems that shallow linguistic contrast in styles is a direct correlate of the fluidity of roles symbolized by the distinction between caste and class.'

Gunderson, Doris V. Reading Readiness--Fact and Fancy. Journal of the Reading Specialist, Vol. 11, October 1965.

D. Fourteen studies in the area of reading readiness are surveyed. Much of the research is directed at the child who needs a period of readiness, particularly the culturally disadvantaged child.

Gussow, Joan and Beryl L. Bailey. Summary of the Proceedings of the Working Conference on Language Development in Disadvantaged Children. New York, Yshiva University, 1965.

The participants in the conference agreed that the basic goal in language for disadvantaged children should be literacy in Standard English so that they will become employable.

B. Limited language usage constrains the children's intellectual development and social mobility.

C. A descriptive list of areas for research was proposed, including -
  a. Studies of the development of language and its relationship to cognitive processes and the learning function.
  b. Investigation of attitudes toward dialect and bilingualism.
  c. Studies of the motives and procedures for change.
  d. Evaluations of the relevance of the reliance upon language in the school curriculum.

Hall, Edward T. The Silent Language, Garden City, N.Y. Doubleday, 1959

Hall, Edward T. The Hidden Dimension, Garden City, N.Y. Doubleday, 1966.

Hall, Robert A. The African substratum in Negro English. American Speech, 25, 1950.
Review of research-based book.

A. Supported points are: in Turner's book, Africanisms in the Gullah Dialect 1)Gullah Negro English exhibits probable relationship to West African languages; 2) Gullah Negro culture exhibits probable relationship to West African cultures; 3) Gullah Negro English (and possibly other forms of Negro English) is creolized language developed from West African language and customs as well as English.

C. Recommendations are: further study of Negro English.

Hall, Robert A. Hands Off Pidgin English! New York, Albert Daug, 1956.
Research.

A. Supported points are 1) Pidgin and creole languages are entirely valid languages in their own right.

B. Hypothetical points are 1) if sophisticated enough, pidgin and creole languages may be used for educational purposes along with English if desired.

Hammond, Boone. Jargon: The Language of the Ghetto. Pruitt-Igoe Project. Occasional Paper No. 42, presented at the Ph.D. Colloquium, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Washington University, May 1967.
Analysis of the function of jargon and its effect on group solidarity.

B.1. The speech of lower-class Negroes is a manifestation of cultural and social differences that exist between this class and the middle class.
2. The isolation of this sub-culture has led to speech patterns which make extensive use of jargon, a characteristic which blocks communication with the outsider.
3. The jargon used in ghetto speech makes the language very contextual.
4. Verbal skill is highly valued in the ghetto as a game or strategy for social manipulation and prestige.
5. The development of in-group language serves two basic functions:
   a. it insulates the group; and
   b. it identifies one group member with another, promoting social solidarity, identification, and pride among members.

Harms, L.S. Status cues in Speech; extra-race and extra-region identification. Lingua, 12, 1963.
Research.

A.1. Social status may be judged from speech cues.
2. The higher the social status of the speaker, the more comprehension and credibility assigned to what he says.
3. Judgement of social status from speech cues is independent of the race or regional dialect of the hearer-judge.

Harris, Albert J. and Serwer, Blance L. Comparison of reading approaches in first-grade teaching with disadvantaged children. (The Craft Project). Report #CRP-2677. City University of New York, Division of Teacher Education, 1966.

Relative effectiveness of the skills-centered approach and the language-experience approach to teaching reading to disadvantaged urban children was examined.

A.1. Approx. 50 teachers and 1,150 students made up the project sample.
2. Data included pre-test and post-test scores of the pupils and instructional time logs, classroom observations, and preferred reading approaches from their teachers.
3. Findings:
  a Disadvantaged children can learn to read by the same methods used with middle and upper-class children.
  b Basal reader method, employed with skills-centered approach; appeared to be ideal approach.
4. Other methods used were the basal reader method with phonovisual word recognition and two language-experience approaches with and without audio-visual supplementation.
5. Differences among methods were sufficiently small as to be inconclusive.

Harris, Albert J. and others. A third progress report of Craft Project--teaching reading to disadvantaged primary grade urban Negro children. Report #BR-5-0570-IR. Report #CUNY-Ore-RR-67-12. City University of New York, Division of Teacher Education, 1967.

The three year project, comparing reading approaches in first grade teaching, studied the skills-centered approach and the language-experience approach with about 1372 children.

A.1. Second grade results showed that the skills-centered approach was superior to the language-experience approach on the reading tests and in spelling.
2. The audio-visual variation of the language-experience approach was lowest on word discrimination and reading sub-tests.
3. Greater differences among classes within each method indicated that the teacher was more important than the instructional technique.
4. The skills-centered approach produced superior results in spelling and the pilot method produced superior results in vocabulary and word study skills.

Harter, Helen. English is fun, or the rhythm and song approach to the teaching of English to non-English-speaking beginners. 1960.

An approach to teaching English as a second language to Spanish speaking first-graders is illustrated.

C.1. Various vocabulary units and books suitable for the Spanish speaking first-grader are presented in appropriate drills, songs, games, stories, dances, and nursery rhymes.
2. Brief discussions of the use of Spanish in the classroom and teaching English as a second language in relation to reading, phonics, numbers and art are included.

Hartung, Charles. Doctrine of English usage. English Journal, 45, 1956.

C. Teachers of English must take on an approach which incorporates language as it is actually spoken and used rather than a doctrine of fixed antiquated language rules.

Haugen, Einar. Problems of bilingual description. General Linguistics, 1, 1955.

Research based.

A.1. A young child learning a second language usually keeps it separate from the first and is often unable to translate between the two.

2. The adult learner of a second language usually has facility with the second language only as diaphomic and kiamorphic with the first.

C.1. Successful language learning depends on keeping the two or more systems separate so that they may coexist independently.

Haugh, Oscar M. (Ed.) Teaching the Teacher of English: Selected Papers and Addresses Delivered at the Conference on English Education, Part, II, University of Colorado, March 1968.

The 11 papers in this collection deal with problems and ideas in teaching the teacher of English.

D.1. Authors' names and descriptions of their papers are given.

2. The last two essays, by J. Harvey Littrell and Robert E. Shafer, deal with the preparation of teachers of reading and of the disadvantaged.

Hayakawa, D.I. Language in Thought and Action. Paper, Florida Council of Teachers of English Conference, 1966.

Communication is retarded when a learned vocabulary becomes more important for its social than its communicative functions.

C.1. Instead of severely correcting the culturally deprived speaker of non-Standard English, the teacher's first concern should be what is communicated, not how it is communicated.

2. Must suppress our obsession with grammar before it destroys the open atmosphere which encourages the ability to learn any dialect, including the Standard dialect.

3. Should work to nurture in students a sensitivity to the meta-messages in communications--the subtleties of tone and implication growing out of connotative meaning, figurative language, intonation and emphasis.

Hayes, Alfred S. (Ed.) Literacy, Washington D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 1965.

A.1. The spread of literacy among the illiterate is slow.

2. Literacy is necessary for meaningful development.

C.1. Related research and guides in

a. descriptive linguistics,

b. experimental psychology,

c. socio-economics.

Hayes, Alfred S. and others. Language research in progress. Report No. 1, June 1965, Cross-referenced list of documented language research projects, current Jan.-May 1965. Report #CAL-1-June 1965. Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington D.C.

This four-part report lists 438 language research projects.

D.1. Part I lists projects by principal investigator, institution, and title.
2. Part II lists alphabetically persons working on one or more of these recorded projects.
3. Part III lists main subject categories and sub-categories, based on key words selected from the reports.
4. Part IV is an alphabetized and cross-referenced Thesaurus of subject-matter headings.

Hayes, Alfred S. and others. Inventory of projects and activities in reading and English. Report No. 1, Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington D.C. 1966.

Descriptions of programs are arranged by state and by level of instruction.

Information is included in the following kinds of activities:
D.1. Programs to exploit advances in linguistic science and related fields.
2. Projects to explore ways of handling the special language problems of speakers of non-standard varieties.
3. School-based comparative experiments.
4. Studies of language arts and English curricula.
5. Projects to prepare new teaching materials and/or tests.
6. Projects to exploit audio-visual aids.
7. Scholarly research directly related to any of the above.

Hayes, Alfred S. Language research in progress. Report No. 4, February 1967, a cross-referenced list of documented language research projects current June-December 1966. Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C., 1967.

Information on 633 language research projects is contained in this bibliogrphy.

D.1. Part I comprises a Thesaurus and category listing.
2. Part II is an alphabetical listing of investigators and institutions.
3. Part III is a numerical listing of projects.
4. A list of on-going research projects for which no abstracts are available is appended.

Hazard, Patrick D. Tradition and innovation in the craft of English-reconnaissance for a war on aesthetic poverty. Report #NDEA-VIIB-502, Contract OEC-5-16-002. 1966.

An attempt was made to report ways of accelerating innovation in the English teaching.

D.1. Through questionnaires to state education departments and a mailing list of opinion leaders, priorities were established.

2. The study suggested a few ways the humanist could use mass communication to help solve problems of mass education.
3. Two radio series--"Talking Sense" and "Literacy 1970" were appended to the report.
4. Study also included raw materials for sound filmstrips and films (Transparencies, tape, and footage) on two critical problems -
   a. Teaching the disadvantaged in primary schools.
   b. Teaching generative rhetoric in high schools.

Hennigan, Charles Taylor. An Inquiry Intothe Oral Communication Patterns of Eight Disadvantaged Pre-School Negro Boys in Houston, Texas. Dissertation, University of Houston, 1967.

Study of the effects of a four-week period of enrichment activities upon the verbal content in the oral expressions of eight disadvantaged pre-school Negro boys in Houston, Texas, 1966.

A.1. The language difficulties of the children included teaching methodology, racial class sociology, and physical and mental growth and development.
2. These multiple factors necessitated use of varied data-gathering techniques.
   a. Children's home life explored through visits by investigators and a social worker.
   b. Periodical record of subject's behavior in the form of anecdotal comments.
   c. Physical health reported through physical examination.
3. A depth of environmental deprivation for the families of most of the subjects was discovered.
   a. Five children lived in homes without a father.
   b. Seven children lived in families with five or more siblings in the home.
   c. Most lived in sub-standard houses.
   d. Low educational attainment of parents who had menial jobs.
   e. General family economic position was poor.
4. Testing indicated linguistic improvement for six of eight children.
5. One child showed no gain or loss.
6. One failed to complete the test due to short attention span.
7. Average age gains of four children were sufficient to raise their represented language ages to a degree equal to or above their chronological age expectations.
8. The average total language age gain of the seven subjects was 7.86 months.

Higgins, V. Louise. Approaching Usage in the Classroom. English Journal, 49, 1960.

B.1. The English teacher is the arbiter of usage in the classroom.
2. 'Usage is psychologically based'.
3. 'Varieties of usage constitute varying degrees of social acceptance'.

C.1. Teachers better prepared for encountering usages of pupils.
2. A teaching of the appropriate usage for the appropriate social setting.

Hill, Archibald A. Correctness and style in English composition. College English, 12, 1951.

Research based.

B. The propriety of a usage varies with social setting.

C. The teacher should have a realistic sense of usage propriety in teaching usage.

Hobson, Arline. The Marie Hughes Language Training Model. Tuscon, Arizona. National Lab. on Early Childhood Education, Research and Development Center. 1969.

A model for language training was developed and is being used in the primary grades of the public schools to assist disadvantaged Spanish-American children who were handicapped by limited language learning and inability to express themselves.

C.1. Model based on John Carroll's grammatical analysis, and involves teaching the skills of sentence transformation, sequencing, associating and categorizing.

2. Increased variety and control of verbal expression is a primary aim of Hughes development model.

3. Interesting curriculum activities, including trips and sensory experiences, are offered to provide stimuli to get children to talk.

4. Verbal expression elicited and reinforced by the teacher and her technical assistants.

Hoenigswald, Henry M. Bilingualism, presumable bilingualism and diachrony. Anthropological Linguistics, 4(1), 1962.

Research based.

A. Bilingualism and bidialectism may differ in that for the latter, the distinction between learning and borrowing is blurred.

Hoffman, Virginia. Oral English at Rough Rock; A New Program for Navaho Children. Rough Rock, Chinle, Arizona. Navaho Curriculum Center, 1968.

Illustrated document describes a program developed at Rough Rock which emphasizes oral expression with the use of dramatic dialog.

C.1. The demonstration school is directed by local Navaho Indians who are -

a. attempting to present both Navaho and American cultures.

b. concentrating on teaching English as a second language.

2. Descriptions and examples are given of materials designed for elementary students at the primary level.

Holbrook, David. English for the Rejected. New York (Cambridge). Cambridge University Press, 1964.

Research based.

A.1. Rejected children are usually not dealt with by teachers in the correct way so that they are categorically frustrated in the school system.

B. Children's writings, drawings, etc. may be used to analyze the reason(s) for their lack of adaptability to the school situation and to indicate the cure.

C. Use of creative activities to analyze and remedy backward children.

Hollman, Raymond. Psycholinguistics: A New Look at How Children Learn the Structure of their Language. In N.C.T.E. The Glaring Edges of Secondary English: Essays by the Experienced Fellows of the University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois, N.C.T.E. , 1968.

Paper discusses the growth of the field of psycholinguistics, what its practitioners have discovered and the implications of these new theories and discoveries for the teaching of English.

B. In English language instructions, teachers have failed to consider what the child already knows about the structure of his language.

C. 'Most obvious avenue of expression that will reveal the linguistic competence of the child is his speech, and the language teacher at all levels must provide opportunities for the child to express himself orally to reveal that competence and improve his performance.'

Horowitz, Frances Degen and Floyd Horowitz. Head Start Evaluation and Research Center. University of Kansas, Report No. XI, Verbal Recall Research, 1969.

About 60 three-, four- and five-year-old children (Head Start and middle-class) were administered a language test to determine their language usage level.

A.1. The test involved the presentation of strings of phonemes organized on five levels of intelligibility:
  a. nonsense words,
  b, nonsense words with a verb in the middle of the string,
  c. recognizable words in non-grammatical form,
  d. simple sentences,
  e. transform sentences; sentences which necessitate transformation of a word or two to be grammatically correct.
2. The child was asked to repeat the words to the experimenter.
3. Findings -
  a. the older the child, the more complete is his recall of words in higher order word formations.
  b. for strings of nonsense words, however, the five-year-olds did not do any better than the three- and four-year olds.
  c. It appears that language ability of the Head Start child on the experimental task is about one year behind that of the middle class child.

Howe, Elliott C. Programs for Bilingual Students of Utah. Conference of Southwest Council of Foreign Language Teachers, El Paso, Texas, November 1967.

Due to a shortage of qualified teachers for bilingual students, several approaches are being utilized to up-grade the students' education.

C.1. Teaching accelerated Spanish courses to native speakers of the language.
  2. Using teacher aides in teaching English as a second language.
  3. Having Mormon families to take Indian children into their families during the school year.
  4. Reducing class sizes and having a smaller ratio of bilingual students to English speaking children.
  5. Arts and crafts classes for Navajo children to exploit their native abilities.
  6. Expanding all areas of curriculum.

Howe, Harold. Cowboys, Indians and American Education. Paper, National Conference on Educational Opportunities for Mexican-Americans, Austin, Texas, 1968.

The failure of the schools to educate the Mexican-American child is, in part, due to an Anglo-American point of view which discourages diverse cultures in our society.

C.1. Mexican-American children must learn English but should not have to reject the Spanish language.
  2. Instruction should be conducted in other languages in order to improve foreign and domestic relations.
  3. Schools must have leadership and proper direction in the use of federal aid if respect for diverse cultures is to become a reality.

Hubbard, James L. and Leonore T. Zarate. Final report on Head Start Evaluation and Research - 1966-67 to the Institute for Educational Development. Section IV, An Exploratory Study of Oral Language Development among Culturally Different Children. Report #IED-66-1. Texas University, Austin, Child Development Evaluation and Research Center, 1967.

A 15 item oral language development scale was created to evaluate the language ability of 49 Head Start and 105 Non-Head Start disadvantaged pupils in first and second grades in Austin, Texas.

A.1. The children were asked questions by a teacher, and their spontanious expressions were taped and then independently evaluated by 2 teachers on the rating scale.
  2. Scores were divided into 12 groups reflecting differences in characteristics of the participating students on 3 dimensions.
    a. Head Start or Non-Head Start.
    b. First or second grade.
    c. High, middle or low reading ability.
  3. Results -
    a. No real significant differences between the Head Start and Non-Head Start groups over the other 2 dimensions.
    b. Fall and spring scores showed that only middle ability first grade Head Start pupils made considerable improvement in language development from Fall to Spring session.
    c. Inconclusiveness of results was probably due to the type of measuring procedure used.

Hubbard, Louise J. Modern Foreign Languages for the Racially Disadvantaged. Modern Language Journal, Vol. 52, No. 3, 1968.

The view that disadvantaged children with non-Standard English have little to gain from the study of a foreign language is challenged. Ways in which teaching methods in language classes reinforce successful methods of teaching the disadvantaged are identitied.

B. The study of a foreign language with emphasis on communication and an audio-lingual approach, is considered potentially beneficial for such students since the language class ideally is given in the second language.

Hurgen, Einar. Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide. University of Alabama Press, Alabama, 1956.

Research and Bibliography.

A.1. Bilinguals are beset with the problem of learning two alternative cognitive sets.
2. In order to be successful in either social set, the bilingual must be able to keep separate the two languages and use the appropriate language in the appropriate social setting.
3. Most bilinguals cannot keep the two languages entirely separate and are therefore at a disadvantage in both social settings.

C.1. Linguistic analysis of both languages.
2. A systematic attack on the problem.

Hymes, D. (Ed.) The Ethnography of Communication. American Anthropology, Special Publication, 66, 1964.

Jacobs, Charles C. An approach to migrant bilingual education. Delaware State Department of Public Instruction, Dover, 1967.

The increased number of Spanish-speaking migrant workers utilized in New Jersey agriculture has necessitated developing educational programs for bilingual students.

D.1. Document presents activities and rationale designed to help such children in becoming bi-lingual and bi-cultural.
2. Included are English-to-Spanish word lists to familiarize teachers with a basic Spanish vocabulary.
3. Emphasis is on student involvement in oral activities to increase communication skills in an unfamiliar language.

Jensen, J. Vernon. Effects of childhood bilingualism. Elementary English, 39, 1962.

Research based. This work presents the pro's and con's of childhood bilingualism as seen by various people in the areas of speech development, language development, intellectual development, education, emotional development, and social development.

C. Present research is inadequate.

John, Vera P. The Intellectual Development of Slum Children; Some Preliminary findings. Reading in Educating the Disadvantaged. Joe A Apple, Editor, Selected Academic Readings Inc., College Division, New York, 1967.

A study of lower-lower, upper-lower and middle-class children showed that small differences in socioeconomic background influence the development of specific language skills.

A.1. Middle and lower class children have equal ability to enumerate, but lower class children have inferior skills in concept integration probably due to lack of adults who have and would listen to the lower class child and correct him and respond to what he says.

2. A lower class child may have equal intelligence, but he is unlikely to have the integrative and summarizing ability which would enable him to choose the most appropriate single response to a complex question on an intelligence test.

3. Wide variation of scores with first-grade children. By the fifth grade, 8 children's responses become quite uniform within a given class - especially within the middle class.

4. In statistical work, uniform scores become apparent, but varying scores cancel each other out.

5. It could not be proved, contrary to expectations, that middle class children excel in the ability to respond to a spoken noun with another noun, without the aid of verbally responsive youths.

6. Middle class children are able to categorize in a manner which shows a higher degree of language skills.

7. Although the sample group was small in this test, social class difference seemed clear at the fifth grade level.

C.1. Need for further research into the relationship of precise life experiences to the development of language.

2. The goal should be new teaching techniques to help children acquire these rudimentary skills and thus to improve their educational performance.

John, Vera. Communicative competence of low-income children--assumptions and programs. New York, Yeshiva University, 1967.

Intervention programs to improve the language skills of disadvantaged children should be regularly evaluated and improved as more is learned about language and cognitive development.

B.1. There is a difference between language as a communicative process and language as an intellective process.

2. The role of language in thought needs pragmatic examination.

3. Filling the gap in language learning is not solely a quantitative matter.

C.1. A sociolinguistic approach to language development should be attempted.

Johnson, Marjorie Seddon and Kress, Ray A. (Eds.) Significant Issues in Reading. Proceedings of the Annual Reading Institute at Temple University of the Commonwealth System of Higher Education, Vol. 5, 1966. Philadelphia, Temple University, Reading Clinic, Department of Psychology, 1968.

The 12 papers examine issues of importance in the field of reading by first identifying and defining the crucial issues and then by providing for their illumination.

D.1. Some issues discussed are comprehension, evaluation, research and vocabulary.
2. Also discussed are beginning reading, remedial reading, reading materials, word recognition, content reading, and study skills.
3. Other issues include educationally disadvantaged pre-school children and a linguistic approach to reading.

Karnes, Merle and other. Activities for developing psycholinguistic skills with pre-school culturally disadvantaged children. Urbana Institute of Research for Exceptional Children, Urbana, 1966.

This guide presents activities designed to improve communication and information processing skills, as well as to ameliorate deficits.

C.1. Generally the manual follows the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities, except for a section on visual closure derived from Wepman. The manual is divided into 10 areas of communication processes: auditory decoding, visual decoding, auditory vocal association, vocal encoding, motor encoding, auditory-vocal automatic, auditory-vocal sequential, visual-motor sequential, and visual closure.
2. For each of the 10 areas, activities are suggested, such as games, puzzles, drawings, musical adaptations, art projects, or dramatics. Explanations for use and diagrams are provided.

Karnes, Merle B. and others. A comparative study of two pre-school programs for culturally disadvantaged children--a highly structured and a traditional program. Report #BR-5-1181. Contract OEC-6-10-235. Illinois University, Urbana Institute of Research for Exceptional Children, 1966.

This study reports the first phase of a 5-year longitudinal investigation of the comparative effectiveness of a highly structured pre-school program and a traditional nursery school program.

A.1. The highly structured program is intended to overcome particular weaknesses of disadvantaged children with particular stress placed on language skills.
2. The 55 subjects were pre- and post-tested with the Stanford Binet Intelligence Scale, the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities, the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test and the Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception, and were post-tested with the Metropolitan Readiness Tests.
3. Comparisons indicated that:
   a. Experimental subjects showed significantly greater progress in measured I.Q.
   b. Overall progress in psycholinguistic abilities was essentially

the same for both groups.
c. The control group showed slightly higher vocabulary gains although the groups did not differ significantly.
d. The experimental group showed greater gains in visual perceptual development, and
e. The experimental group scored significantly higher in each area of the readiness tests.

B. The results suggest that the highly structured program is more effective, but final evaluation must await the evaluation of the performance of the subjects in school.

Kasdon, Lawrence M. Language experience approach for children with non-standard dialects. Paper. National Council of Teachers of English Conference, Honolulu, 1967.

The language experience approach to reading is presented as a total approach to reading rather than as a method.

C.1. The child is encouraged to express his thoughts about his environment. The child's own words are recorded for him, and only gross errors are changed to comply with grammatical structuring.
2. Phoneme-grapheme correspondence across dialectal lines should be taught cautiously. Spelling across dialects should be uniform.
3. Teachers should allow the child to read in his dialect and should remember that spelling may not determine pronunciation.
4. It is recommended that:
   a. The language experience approach be used with children as early as possible.
   b. Speech, vocabulary, and concepts be developed continuously.
   c. Skills be taught systematically.
   d. Audio-visual instruction be used with the approach.
   e. Questions promote thinking and the use of the language.
   f. The best teachers be employed.

Kelly, William M. If you're woke you dig it. New York Times Magazine, May 20, 1962.

Research based.

A. Negro vocabulary often differs from that of Standard English (article contains abbreviated vocabulary list).

B.1. A Negro culture seeks to keep its vocabulary or code to itself.
2. When people outside the Negro culture become aware of this vocabulary, it changes.

Kenyan, John S. Cultural levels and functional varieties of English. College English, 10, 1948.

B.1. Culturally different levels of language are different from the classificatory notion of functional varieties (colloqual versus formal etc.) of language.
2. Cultural level and functional variety are not mutually exclusive categories.

C. Consideration of spoken English in terms of cultural level and functional variety.

Kirk, Samuel A. Language, intelligence, and the educability of the disadvantaged. In Language Programs for the Disadvantaged. Champaign, Illinois, N.C.T.E., 1965.

Experiment (based on I.Q. and other ratings).

A.1. Around age 3 or 4 and before is the greatest development in language and intellectual ability and consequently intellectual and linguistic stimulation at this age has its most far reaching effects.
  2. Language and intellectual disabilities are not isomorphic with socio-economic disadvantage and should not be approached as though they were.
  3. Special training addressed to specific needs can bring about better scoring on intelligence tests.
C. Pre-school training for the intellectually and linguistically deprived.

Kitzhaber, Albert R. A mature attitude toward usage. Language Curriculum VI, student version. Report #BR-5-0366-86. Contract OEC-5-10-319, Eugene, University of Oregon, 1968.

This language unit on usage for 12th grade students is divided into six sections - 'Introduction to the Students', 'Usage in the High School English Class', 'Variations within Standard American English', 'Bases for Judgments about Usage', and 'Characteristics of a Mature Attitude Toward Usage'.

Four exercises direct the student to do the following:

C.1. Examine differences between American and British English, among American dialects, and among usages on varying social levels.
  2. Identify the usage levels of numerous expressions.
  3. Analyze a specific expression, the usage level of which is not readily apparent.
  4. Define 'good English'.

Kitzhaber, Albert R. Varieties of English, using the dictionary--language curriculum I, student version. Report #CRP-H-149-20 and BR-5-0366-20. Eugene, University of Oregon, 1965.

C. A study guide was prepared for student use in a seventh-grade language curriculum. Background information about regional dialects, social dialects, social dialects, and functional varieties of English were included with related exercises. Guide also described a unit on using the dictionary.

Kitzhaber, Albert R. Varieties of English, using the dictionary--language curriculum I, teacher version. Report #CRP-H-149-21, and BR-5-0366-21. Eugen, University of Oregon, 1965.

A guide for teacher use was prepared for a seventh-grade language curriculum. Included were background information, suggestions for introducing units on 1) varieties of English and 2) using the dictionary, an annotated bibliography teaching method descriptions, exercises and answers.

Knowlton, Clark S. Spanish-American schools in the 1960's. Speech prepared for 1966 Teacher Orientation in West Las Vegas, New Mexico City, 1966.

B.1. The plight of the Indians and the Spanish American people is due to deprivation from political office, sociological advancement economic security, educational success and from lack of knowledge of their historical background.

C. The author proposes:

a. To evaluate the Spanish American historical and cultural roles in the future of the Southwest.

b. To make the Spanish American people and entire nation aware of their tragic experiences.

c. To arouse the federal and state governments so that the conditions of poverty, discrimination, and apathy may be overcome.

d. To instruct the bilingual Mexican-American and Spanish-American students in both Spanish and English.

Knowlton, Clark S. Bilingualism--A problem or an asset. Anthony School District, New Mexico, 1965.

The author discusses problems associated with bilingualism in New Mexico and Texas schools.

A.1. Schools are biased against Spanish speaking students in the following ways:

a. Low taxing ability of community provides only for ill-staffed and ill-equipped schools.

b. Students cannot learn other subject matter before they master English.

c. Spanish-speaking children learn to regard their native language and culture as inferior.

C.1. The schools should teach these students in their native language while they are mastering English.

2. Creative synthesis of the Southwest cultures will produce classrooms in which the fullest potential of Anglo-American, Mexican-American, and Indian cultures will be attained.

Koenig, F.G. Improving the language abilities of bilingual children. Exceptional Children, 19, 1953.

B. Bilingual children tend often to feel insecure in the school situation due to less fluency in the school language and begin stuttering or withdrawal.

C. Building up language ability by concentration on non-verbal creative activities which no longer make language itself the central, contextual focus of expression.

Kohl, Herbert R. Teaching the 'unteachable' the story of an experiment in children's writing. New York, New York Review, 1967.

Slum children need to be allowed to discuss and write about their own experiences and not about, for example, the progress of American.

B.1. These children may be afraid to express themselves because they feel the teacher cannot be trusted.

C.1. Stories concerning suffering of various peoples and discussions of words with mythological origins may be used to catch their interest and win their confidence.
  2. Initially disadvantaged children should not be encumbered with grammatical and spelling rules for eventually they will try to write as well as possible.
  3. That they do learn to write is extremely important for society.

Kurath, Hans. Area Linguistics and the Teacher of English. Language Learning, Special Issue, No. 2, 1961.

Research based.

A.1. Dialects, usage, and pronunciation vary regionally and sociologically.
  2. There may be many such variations among pupils of a single school.
  3. 'Correctness' varies with region and social status.

C.1. Teachers should become familiar with the variations of English with which they are confronted.
  2. All variations except those of lower class should be acceptable in the classroom.

Labov, William. The Social Stratification of English in New York City. Washington D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966.

Research.

A.1. Language is invariably systematic.
  2. Unique deviation from a standard language may occur with any socially, ethnically, or geographically distinct group, any three of which may be correlated.

Labov, William. Some sources of reading problems for Negro speakers of non-standard English. 1966.

The author attempts to supply a systematic basis for the study of the English of Negro and Puerto Rican children.

D.1. Two basic types of problems:
  a. Ignorance of Standard English rules on the part of speakers of non-Standard English.
  b. Ignorance of non-Standard English rules on the part of teachers and text writers.
  2. The author summarizes phonological and grammatical features found generally in Negroes' speech and the consequences of these problems for teaching reading.
  3. Most serious difficulty results from the deviation of the underlying grammatical structure of non-standard speech from that of Standard English.

Labov, William. The non-standard vernacular of the Negro community--some practical suggestions. Report #BR-5-0345. Contract OEC-6-10-059. Columbia University, New York, 1967.

In comparing Standard English with the non-standard dialects of urban ghettos, it was found that there is a difference in the relative depth or abstractness of the unconscious grammatical rules.

A.1. In memory or 'shadow' tests with groups of Negro boys from 10 to 14 years old, results indicated that some standard forms, such as 'is' were easily remembered and repeated. Sentences with Standard English negation forms or 'if' clauses were understood but were repeated in non-standard dialect.

2. Research also shows that children judged 'non-verbal' in language tests actually had rich verbal resources when stimulated by sophisticated techniques.

B.1. The adult Negro community shares the normative social values of the larger white community. Negro teenagers, however, associate Standard English with 'effeminacy, gentility, and over-cultivation'.

2. Children and adolescents can be motivated to learn Standard English by emphasizing its value for influencing and controlling other people, since this is the use for which verbal skills are already prized in the vernacular culture.

Labov, William, Contraction, deletion, and inherent variability of the copula. New York, Columbia University, 1968.

Research.

A. The form of the copula is different in Negro non-Standard English and Standard English.

B. Negro non-Standard English and Standard English are same in deep structure but different in surface structure.

C.1. Non-Standard English and Standard English are the same basically.

2. More research is used on Non-Standard auxiliary forms.

Labov, William. A study of non-Standard English. Washington D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

The defects in viewing non-Standard English as an imperfect copy of Standard English have become a matter of urgent concern in the face of the tremendous educational problems of the urban ghetto.

D.1. This paper looks at non-Standard English as an integral part of the larger sociolinguistic structure of the English language.

2. The author first presents some linguistic considerations on the nature of language itself, and then a number of sociolinguistic principles which have emerged in the research of the past ten years.

3. Relation of non-standard dialects to education is reviewed, bearing in mind that the fundamental role of the school is to teach the reading and writing of Standard English.

4. Finally, the author turns to the question of what research teachers and educators can do in the classroom--the kind of immediate and applied research which will help them make the best use of teaching materials.

Labov, William and Cohen, Paul. systematic relations of standard and non-standard rules in the grammars of Negro speakers. Project Literary Reports #8, Cornell University. Report #BR-5-0545. 1967.

This paper discusses the intersection of the non-Standard English dialect of the urban ghettos and Standard English.

A.1. The data gathered included a random sample of 100 lower- and middle-income adults in three areas of south central Harlem.

A.2. Although Negro speech patterns have been explained as the product of dialect mixture of two originally uniform grammars, these data do not support such a construction. Rules are described which embody continuous variation at all age levels, as well as other rules representing adjustments in conditions on standard rules which have proved unstable in the history of English.

3. Generally, the authors investigations indicate that differences between this dialect and Standard English are greater on the surface than in the underlying grammatical structure.

Labov, William and Cohen, Paul. Some suggestions for teaching Standard English to speakers of non-standard dialects. Report #Br-5-0545. Contract OEC-6-10-059. New York, Columbia University, 1967.

This paper was submitted to the New York City Board of Education for use in preparing a manual for language arts in grades 5 to 12.

D.1. The structural conflicts between the vernacular of the urban ghettos and the Standard English of the classroom are discussed.

2. Suggestions are designed to present information on the phonology and the grammar of non-Standard and Negro dialects in a form useful to the English teacher.

3. Some grammatical points discussed are:
   a. Verb tenses
   b. Forms of the noun
   c. Negation patterns
   d. Pronouns
   e. Embedded questions
   f. Count and mass nouns.

4. The authors discuss articulation and pronunciation patterns in non-standard speech and present suggestions for preparing materials to teach contrastive patterns.

5. The linguistic terminology used in the report is understandable by the non-specialist.

LaBrant, Lou. Untapped resources of Negro students. Negro American Lit. Forum, Vol. 1, Winter 1967.

Intonation and a non-standard vocabulary are two devices which enable Negroes to make subtle language distinctions which tests do not measure or sample.

B.1. Negro students are capable of much greater subtlety of expression than their relatively small number of vocabulary words implies.

2. The Negro learns early to watch every gesture, expression, and posture of Caucasians and thus acquires an ability essential in drama, both in determining meaning and in acting.

3. Having learned also to distinguish between reality and what is said about democracy, the Negro develops a fine sense of irony and a deep skepticism which can be utilized as invaluable critical tools.

4. Because most Negro students view education as a means of entering the mainstream of American life, they eagerly read novels and plays which present the American scene fairly and clearly.

C.1. English teachers should become acquainted with and introduce literature of the African theater which Negro students greatly enjoy.

Lado, Robert. Linguistics Across Cultures. Ann Arbor, Michigan, University of Michigan Press, 1957.

Research based.

C. To most effectively teach a person a second language, the teacher must have a scientific description of the person's native language and culture and a parallel description of the language and culture to be taught.

Lamberts, J.J. Another look at Kenyon's levels. College English, 24. 1962.

Research based.

A.1. 'Correctness' is totally relative to social circumstances, i.e. 'One man's standard is another's sub-standard'.
2. Children being taught 'correct' usage in school may not learn it because it is not an accepted mode of speech at home.

C. More research for a more realistic approach to dealing with language usage.

Lancaster, Louise. Introducing English: an oral pre-reading program for Spanish-speaking primary pupils. Boston, Houghton Miflin, 1966.

This 28 unit oral program was prepared as a guide for teachers of Spanish-speaking four, five and six year old children who are learning English for the first time.

C.1. A basic speaking vocabulary of five to six hundred words, used in meaningful sentence patterns, is presented in graded and controlled sequences.
2. The audio-lingual method is explained in the introduction.
3. The material is based on recent linguistic research and a contrastive analysis of Spanish and English.
4. Step-by-step directions to the teacher are included with each lesson.

Lane, Harlan and others. The perception of general American English by speakers of Southern dialects, in Studies in Language and Language Behavior. Contract OEC-3-6-061784-05-8, Center for Research in Language and Behavior. Michigan University, Ann Arbor, 1967.

Linguistic research shows that speech patterns of Southern Negroes constitute a legitimate dialect with phonological and grammatical rules somewhat different from general American English.

A.1. Samples of general American English were tape-recorded by two native speakers of general American English and played to 25 Negro and 16 Caucasian university students in Alabama.
2. Each student was asked to report or write down what he heard from the tape recordings.
3. Results -
   a. The mean score for the Negro students was lower than for the Caucasian students under all test conditions.
   b. Both groups performed less well than listeners who were native speakers of general American English.
   c. It appears that speakers of the Southern Negro dialect commit

more errors when attempting to correctly perceive general American English than do Caucasian students from the same geographic area and of the same social and economic level.

LaPray, Margaret H. Reading as a second language. Paper. National Council of Teachers of English Conference, 1967.

Students who speak non-Standard English and students who know a limited word meaning but are unable to translate that word into a new subject area content both need reading instruction as though Standard American English were their second language.

C. All content area teachers must teach vocabulary, content and reading skills in the language of their subject matter.
D. The San Diego City Schools program for junior high atypical readers is discussed as a good example of a reading program with total staff involvement.

Lavatelli, C.B. Critical overvies of early childhood education programs. Paper, Head Start conference, Berkeley, 1968.

The author states that some of the developmental principles that apply to language training also apply to intellective processes; therefore, application of these training principles should lead to a higher level of intellectual functioning.

B.1. A mother or teacher who expands the child's sentences improves his environment.
2. A teacher who is aware of sentence structure can recognize areas in which a child is weak. These areas can be strenghthened by offering pre-school activities designed to elicit descriptive and comparative responses.
3. Positive reinforcement by the teacher helps to improve the child's communication.
C.1. A child should hear good samples of language usage so he can learn to decode meaning and construct his own responses.

Lavatelli, Celia B. (Ed.) Problems of Dialect. 1967.

Children who learn a dialect differ in pronunciation, syntax, or both from children who learn Standard English.

B.1. Has been assumed that dialectal differences contribute to difficulties in learning to read.
2. Pre-school language programs have been trying to eliminate dialectual pronunciation difference so that children will be better prepared for the first grade.
3. Although a social class prejudice against dialect exists, there is no agreement as to whether dialects reflecting sub-standard grammar are a hindrance to thinking processes.
4. European children who speak regional dialects use standard language at school without resulting learning deficits.
C.1. Experimental work needed to identify and plan for use of certain syntactical systems in remedial work with pre-school children.

Lawton, Denis. Social class language differences in group discussions. Language and Speech, 7, Part 3, 1964.

Experiment.

A. Social differences in speech are presented age 12 and increase in the following three years.

C. Changes in the character of secondary education.

Lawton, Denis. Social Class Language and Education. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968.

Libaw, Frieda B. The Lingua Plan. Los, Angeles, Galton Institute, 1968.

A description is given of 'The Lingua Plan' a bilingual program developed by the staff of the Galton Institute to improve the education of Mexican-American children who enter kindergarten with little or no knowledge of English.

C.1. Major purpose of project is to determine whether
  a. classroom use of child's native language,
  b. use of materials which reflect Mexican-American cultural values,
  c. a combination of both, is most effective in raising level of achievement of these children.
2. The comparative effectiveness of these factors would be tested through actual classroom teaching.
3. Procedures to implement the plan center on
  a. Selection of children and teachers.
  b. Teacher training, curriculum development.
  c. Evaluation.
  d. Dissemination of findings.

Lin, San-Su. Pattern Practice in the Teaching of Standard English to Students with a Non-Standard Dialect. New York, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia Univerity, 1965.

Research.

A.1. A given area has its own socially acceptable and socially unacceptable dialects.
2. teachers of traditional grammar tend to think of socially unacceptable dialects as 'bad' (or immoral) English.
3. people of non-standard dialect may be taught the standard dialect there (a) analyses of both dialects involved and (b) pattern drills hitting the points of conflict.
4. the student must want to learn a second dialect before he can.

C. The teacher must acquire and apply a more objective notion of culture and language usage in teaching Standard English.

Lloyd, Donal G. Subcultural patterns which affect language and reading development, in Language, Linguistics and School Programs. Proceedings Spring Institutes. Champaign Illinois, 1963.

Improving the reading ability of disadvantaged children requires the teacher's acceptance of the child's spoken language.

B.1. These children have pronunciation and vocabularies different from those of average students.

C.1. The teacher should not alienate these children by urging them to conform of 'middle class' English. Instead he should:
  a. emphasize elements common to all speech such as stress and pitch.
  b. teach the child to see the printed pages as an extension of his speech.
  c. guide the child toward seeing phonological phrases and word groupings instead of individual words. This may be accomplished by emphasizing intonation, illustrating nature and value of rhythm, dramatized reading, and teaching meanings of words in context.

Lloyd, Helene M. Is the Reading Instruction that we are Providing the Disadvantaged Adequate? Paper. International Reading Association Conference, 1968.

Reading programs for disadvantaged children are not accomplishing their goal to eliminate the progressively wider gap in reading achievement between socially and economically deprived youngsters and those belonging to the average middle class group.

B.1. Reasons for failure to teach reading effectively to the disadvantaged:
  a. Stimulus deprivation and environmental disadvantage.
  b. Inadequate preparation of teachers and supervisors.
  c. Large classes organized in a tight structure.
  d. Lack of clinical diagnosis and corrective treatment of reading disabilities.
  e. Lack of adequate parent community involvement.
  f. Lack of new tools for evaluation of reading progress.

C.1. Possible remedies:
  a. Expansion of pre-kindergarten program with adequate follow-through.
  b. Planning of sequential developmental reading program with staff involvement.
  c. Reduction of classsize and teaching range.
  d. Organization of pre-service and in-service training courses for teachers and supervisors, and greater parent-community involvement.

Loban, W.D. The Language of Elementary School Children. N.C.T.E. Research Report No. 1, Champaign, Illinois, 1961.

Loban, Walter. A sustained program of language learning. In Language Programs for the Disadvantaged. Champaign, Illinois, N.C.T.E., 1965.

B.1. All English dialects are basically the same grammar.
  2. Lower socio-economic groups use less elaborate English.

C.1. Children in lower grades be encouraged to speak and thereby elaborate their language.
  2. Standard English and the notion of social dialects should be systematically introduced in the upper elementary grades.

Loban, Walter. Teaching children who speak social class dialects. Elementary English, May 1968.

Teachers must attempt to add Standard English to the dialect of disadvantaged pupils rather than to substitute the prestige dialect for the sub-standard one.

C.1. A speaker who is made to feel ashamed of his own language habits suffers a basic injury as a human being.
  a. In preschool programs and the earliest years of school, the emphasis should be upon the child's using whatever dialect of the language he already speaks as the means of thinking, exploring and imagining.
  b. Usually from grade three and after the children's daily recitation should adhere to Standard English.
2. Non-standard oral language should not be left entirely untouched.
  a. Pupils may be exposed to various taped listening experiences (dialogues, skits and riddles) in the standard and non-standard dialect.
  b. Such exercises would focus the pupil's attention upon differences (but not 'correct' or 'incorrect'!)
3. Initial reading instruction should utilize the language experience approach in which the child dictates his own brief 'stories'. The teacher writes what the child says, but illustrates a second way of expressing the statement.
4. Requesting that a child read a statement in the Standard and non-Standard dialect accustoms him to the idea of 'school language'.
5. Oral-aural dialogues which employ the pattern practice drills of foreign language instruction are highly effective in teaching disadvantaged children.
6. In about grade five, six or seven, the teacher should discuss with pupils the facts of social language discrimination. Pupils need to understand the social consequences the world will exact of them if they cannot handle the established dialect.
7. The oral tradition in English instruction must be restored in order to accomplish ear training. Taped drills may be alternated with dramatics, literature, discussion and writing.
8. Children who speak a social class dialect need the opportunity to learn standard usage if they are to be free to choose whether or not they will use it.

Loban, Walter. Problems in oral English: Kindergarten through Grade Nine. Research Report No. 5, Champaign, Illinois, N.C.T.E., 1968.

Over a 10-year period, the oral language development of 338 pupils was studied to establish the most crucial and frequent oral language difficulties.

A.1. Recorded samples from each subject were segmented by oral intonation patterns and systactic units, and were analyzed early in terms of 21 oral language problems or deviations from Standard English.
2. Progress in resolving difficulties was plotted for four groups - Caucasians with high and low language proficiency, Negroes with low language proficiency, and a random sample.
3. Results -

a. Difficulties for children not handicapped by social dialect are in developing coherence and organization. Individual instruction in this area is more helpful than drill in usage.
b. Conversely, the most persistent problems for Negro children are those of usage, particularly compound verbs and the verb 'to be'. Oral drill based on expressing ideas, attitudes, and values of concern to the learners is more effective than workbook drill.

Loflin, Marvin D. A note on the deep structure of non-standard English in Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington D.C. 1966.

Ambiguous sentences with 'be' in the non-standard speech of Negroes are discussed.

A.1. A sampling is taken from the speech of children between the ages of 8 to 14 in the Washington D.C. area.
2. Three diagrams show deep structure differences which give three different interpretations to the sentences 'I be busy' or 'When you come, I be busy'.
3. In addition to the modals 'will' and 'would', there is a third 'habituative' category, which represents a recurring activity engaged in at specific times.
B.1. The author hypothesizes that there are differences in the underlying semantic structure (deep structure), between non-standard Negro speech and other dialects of English, and that a 'habituative' category must be postulated to remove structural ambiguity.

Loflin, Marvin D. A note on the deep structure of non-standard English in Washington D.C., Glossa, 1, 1967.

Research

A. Non-standard Negro English contains some different co-occurrence relationship between time adverbs and the auxiliary structure 'be' than does Standard English.
C. A. above points toward a deep structure difference between non-standard and standard English (i.e. non-standard and standard English are two different languages).

Loflin, Marvin D. and Sobin, Nicholas J. Transformational rules and competing generalizations in Black American English. University of Missouri at Columbia, 1968. Unpublished

Research.

A. Black American English is evidenced as being different in auxiliary structure from Standard American English.
B. Black American English and Standard American English may well be different languages in accord with present transformational notions.

Loflin, Marvin D. and Sobin, Nicholas J. Auxiliary structure and time adverbs fields in Negro Non-Standard English. Unpublished, University of Missouri at Columbia, 1968.

Research.

A.1. Negro Non-Standard English and Standard American English vary in the following ways:
  a. in the number of auxiliary structures (i.e. these are 6 auxiliary structures for Non-Standard Negro English and 8 auxiliary structures for Standard American English),
  b. in the form of auxiliary structures,
  c. in the co-occurrence between auxiliary structures and time adverbs.

B.1. Time adverbs are same in meaning between Non-Standard Negro English and Standard American English, and therefore
  2. the auxiliary structures of Non-Standard Negro English and Standard American English are not only different in form and quantity but in meaning also.

C.1. Teachers of Non-Standard Negro speakers will need an analysis of Non-Standard Negro English to best teach these people Standard American English.

Loman, Bengt. Conversations in a Negro-American dialect. Washington D.C. Center for Applied Linguistics, 1967.

Free spontaneous conversations of Negro children were recorded in a special 'sound studio' installed in a low-income neighborhood of Washington D.C.

D.1. The passages selected from the recordings for transcription are conversations between members of a family group and neighborhood children.
  2. A modified standard orthography was used for the transcription with prosodic aspects transcribed in a modified Trager-Smith system.
  3. The ultimate aim of the project is to produce the basic linguistic information essential to programs for teaching Standard English to these children.

McCanne, Roy. Approaches to first grade English reading instruction for children from Spanish-speaking homes. Denver, Colorado, State Department of Education, 1966.

Twenty-nine outstanding teachers were selected to conduct a study to determine a sequence of skills appropriate for teaching reading to first grade children from Spanish-speaking homes.

A.1. Three teaching methods were used -
  a. A basal reader approach.
  b. A language-experience approach.
  c. The use of a textbook series designed for teaching English to Spanish-speaking children.
  2. Extensive pre- and post-testing indicated the basal reader approach developed the highest achievement in reading skills.

McCarthy, D.M. The Language Development of the Pre-school Child. Institute of Child Welfare Monograph No. 4, 1930.

McCrossan, John. The reading of the culturally disadvantaged. Illinois University, Urbana, Report #OP-8-. 1966.

Aspects of reading related to culturally disadvantaged adults and children are surveyed.

A.I. Research on reading ability of disadvantaged adults has shown that they read less than more educated people and comprise a large number of the American functional illiterates.
2. Home environment of lower class children contributes to reading retardation.
3. While lower class people read magazines and papers somewhat less than those from higher classes, differences are not as great as those found in book reading.
4. A positive correlation exists between fiction reading and income level.
5. Lower class people tend to read the newspaper for entertainment, sensational news, and pictorial material.

McDavid, Raven I. Jr. dialect differences and intergroup tensions. Studies in Linguistics, 9, 1951.

Research.

A.1. Any person with-out physical deformity is capable of making any of the speech sounds in any language.
2. Language patterns of an individual are determined little by parents' speech patterns and largely by the speech patterns of his social contacts in his speech community.
3. In a given community dialect differences tend to level.
4. The emergence of new dialect difference within a community indicates rising of intergroup tensions in the community.
C.1. Coordination of linguistics and sociology to analyse new, on-coming intergroup tensions so as to apply a remedy before these tensions ignite.

McDavid, Raven I. Jr. American social dialects. College English, 26, 1965.

Research based.

A.1. Minority groups such as Negroes and Puerto Ricans have different problems in language than do average middle class whites.
2. Schools have long known about this and done relatively little about it.
C.1. Formulation of U.S. social dialect profiles.
2. Analysis and comparison of these profiles and attribution to ethnic and social groups.
3. Checking out of social, racial and linguistic factors with popular conceptions.
4. Building rational education on these findings.

McDavid, Raven I. Jr. and Austin, William M. Communication Barriers to the Culturally Deprived. Mimeo, Chicago, 1966.

Research.

A.1. Vocabulary reflects cultural experience and changes with a change in cultural setting.

A.2. Grammar reflects social class and level of educational attainment.
3. The grammatical features which middle class Chicagoans identify as 'Negro grammar' are 'widely distributed in uneducated Southern speech of both races'.
4. Middle class Chicagoans identify both white and Negro speakers with a southern accent as Negro.

C.1. Specially teaching Chicago speakers of southern speech Chicago middle class speech beginning with nursery school.
2. General teaching of the nature of language, dialectology, culture etc. to further human understanding.

MacGinitie, Walter M. Language Development in Ebel, Robert L. Encyclopedia of Educational Research. London, The MacMillan Co., 1969.

Macnamara, John (Ed.) Problems of bilingualism. Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 23, No. 2, 1967.

D. This issue of the Journal of Social Issues is devoted to nine articles on the topic of bilingualism written by authorities in the fields of linguistics, anthropology, sociology, psychology, and education. The authors and their topics are listed.

McNeany, Robert and Keislar, Evan R. How the language of kindergarten children may be developed for use in problem solving. Report #CRP-5-326 and BR-5-8028. Contract OEC-5-10-455. University of California at Los Angeles.

The value of vocalizing during a problem-solving task was studied involving sixty 4-year-old children.

A.1. Children were trained to select the correct one of three pictures differing only in size.
2. There was a labelling group and a non-labelling group.
3. Children in the labelling group who overtly verbalized relevant labels performed significantly better during training and on a post-test than children who saw the same stimuli but received no labelling training.
4. This finding was not verified in an 8 day investigation where stimulus materials and verbal instructions were electronically controlled.
5. Seventy-two 5-year-old children in labelling and non-labelling groups were given training on a task involving materials differing in size, thickness, length, and color value.
6. The labelling group learned four sets of relevant labels.
7. On the post-test, where no children were instructed to verbalize, no differences in performance were found between labelling and non-labelling groups.
8. All children performed worse when the intermediate picture was the correct response.

McNeil, John D. Adapting a beginning reading program for Spanish-speaking children. Paper. AERA Conference, Chicago, 1968.

A study, sponsored by the Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (SWRL), developed learning sequences for a beginning reading program for kindergarten classrooms with Spanish-speaking children throughout the Southwest region.

A.1. Each of 21 10-minute programmed lessons was presented through a tape recorder and visual displays on cards to Spanish-speaking pre-school children. Each child was required to make about 60 oral responses in English during each lesson.
2. Instructions in English were gradually substituted for instruction in Spanish after the child had mastered the task.
3. The test scores of Spanish-speaking children in this program, when compared with the test scores of Egnlish-speaking children who received regular classroom instruction, supported the thesis that it is possible to increase the probabilities of reading success for Spanish-speaking children after careful identification of learner tasks and selection of instructional practices that elicit the desired response to printed stimuli.

Malone, Charles. Psychological Characteristics of the Children. In Harry L. Miller (Ed.) Education for the Disadvantaged: Current Issues and Research. New York, The Free Press, 1967.

The author cites observations of a nursery school teacher on the language of twenty-one 3-5 year old pre-school children.

A.1. When the children first came to school, they were uninterested in learning the names and properties of objects. Brief play depended upon the teacher's involvement.
2. The children communicated mainly by pleading looks, appealing smiles and whimpering.
3. Their vocabularies were small, and the simple words and sentences they used were related mostly to satisfying immediate needs.
4. Their language was rarely employed to seek information, explanations or to solve problems.
5. They tended toward literalness and inflexibility. Once they learned one meaning of a new word, it was extremely difficult to teach them a second meaning.

Manuel, Herschel T. Spanish speaking children of the Southwest, their education and the public welfare. Austin, Texas, University of Texas Press, 1965.

This book is designed to present the problems of Spanish-speaking children, to point out basic relationships and trends, and to consider ways of meeting specific needs.

C.1. The schools need all available devices to offer more contact with spoken and written English.
2. Although command of English is a necessity, Spanish-speaking children at some point in their lives should have an opportunity to become literate in their mother tongue.
D.1. Students, parents, and teachers describe problems, in particular those problems due to the language barrier.

Manuel, Herschel T. Recruiting and training teachers for Spanish-speaking children in the Southwest. Paper. National Education Association Comm., 1966.

The recruitment and training of competent teachers for Spanish-speaking children is but one phase of the overall staffing problem facing schools nationally.

C.1. Programs should emphasize cooperation between school systems and colleges.
2. These teachers must be aware of the characteristics of the disadvantaged generally, and the special problems faced by the Spanish-speaking student.
3. English-speaking assistants might be employed to give more extensive experiences with the English language in interesting activities.
4. Education should be extended downward to include the 5-year-old disadvantaged child in partial compensation for a deficient home environment.

Marckwardt, Albert H. Implications of language processes for the teacher, in Language, Linguistics and School Programs. Proceedings Spring Institutes, Champaign, Illinois, 1963.

Linguistics can aid the teacher of English in convincing students that language is a medium they can control by learning about its structure.

B.1. Knowledge of the processes by which children learn language will enable English teachers to recognize the strength of behavior patterns in usage and non-standard dialects and to be tolerant of them so that students are encouraged to accept and use the standard dialect.
2. Students will accept more readily an insistence upon organization and logic in the teaching of writing if taught as a means of compensating for the lack of signals for stress, pitch, intonation and hesitation in written language.
3. Understanding analogy, the creation of compounds and derivative forms back formation clipping and word blending can be of diagnostic and enabling the teacher to lead the student to an intelligent understanding of how language works and how it can be manipulated.

Martin, Bill Jr. Helping children claim language through literature, Elementary English, 45, May 1968.

The author contends that it is time we discard the negative notion that language is either 'standard' or 'substandard' and substitute instead the notion that language operates effectively on various levels.

B.1. The author divides language into three general levels. They are:
   a. the in-group language of the home,
   b. the public language of society,
   c. the life-lifting language of literature.
2. The school, traditionally, has failed to appreciate in-group language as a successful language.
3. A teacher need only to turn to literature to help

children bridge the gap from home rooted expressions to those that the culture prefers. Teaching a poem in which the expression 'I am not' is reiterated several times is one way of helping children to become aware of the usage of 'I am not' in place of 'I ain't'. Knowing that they have a choice frees children to appreciate their home rooted language and the public language.

C.1. Reading aloud by the teacher and pupil recitation with the teacher should be a basic part of all reading and language instruction.

2. In planning language instruction, a teacher must have a philosophy of language that liberates the human spirit--within her as well as within the children.

Massad, Carylyn Emrick. Language-thought processes in children from differing socio-economic levels. Paper. International Reading Association Conference, 1968.

The subjects were 132 sixth-grade pupils from middle and low socio-economic levels who were tested to establish their intelligence, language aptitude, and creativity.

A.1. Objectives of study -
  a. To define more clearly 'creativity' and 'language aptitude'.
  b. To define the relationships among creativity, language aptitude, and intelligence.
  c. To clarify the role of socio-economic level in determining these relationships.

2. The middle socio-economic groups performed at a significantly higher level on all three tests than did the low socio-economic group.

3. Experimental design basic to the study was a factor analytic design. Results indicated that children from the two levels had different approaches to language tasks and different processes for creative thought.

4. A change in the type of problem requiring divergent productive semantic thinking produced no change in middle socio-economic thought processes, but did produce a change in low socio-economic thought processes.

May, Frank B. Teaching language as communication to children. Columbus, Ohio. Charles E. Merrill, 1967.

This book combines background information on language and communication with methods for developing skills needed to cope with the daily communication problems.

D.1. Comments on environmental effects on language development, on differences in dialects, on reasons for teaching grammar, and on types of grammar precede a discussion of the impact of language on behavior.

2. A consideration of ways to stimulate creative expression, suggested teaching procedures and classroom exercises are included.

Maynes, J.O. Jr. Bilingual education in Arizona. Report 3, Bilingual Programs in the Southwest. Conference of the Southwest Council of Foreign Language Teachers, El Paso, Texas, 1967.

Teachers need training to understand the language and cultural problems of many Arizona people who have Spanish surnames.

C.1. Many school districts and organizations in Arizona are developing bilingual programs and services to help those of Indian, Spanish, and Mexican extraction who are in need.

2. Some of the programs are:
   a. Programs for the educationally and culturally deprived.
   b. Elementary and secondary programs in language arts.
   C. Projects in special education.
   d. Projects in English as a second language.
   e. Cultural enrichment projects.
   f. Programs to develop curriculum materials centers and
   f. Health projects.

Michigan State Department of Public Instruction, Lansing. The disadvantaged child and the language arts. Report #MSDPI-Bull. 368, 1964.

D. This bulletin discusses the culturally disadvantaged child and identifies his language difficulties, lists minimum tasks and realistic objectives for teachers of this group, and describes some techniques developed by the Great Cities Project Schools and some current practices in Michigan language arts programs.

Morrison, Coleman and Harris, Albert J. Grade equivalent comparisons between disadvantaged Negro urban children with and without kindergarten experience when taught to read by several methods. New York, City University of New York, 1968.

Children in grades one through three, with and without kindergarten experience were taught reading by the skills-centrered method (Basal reader and phonovisual) and the language experience method (materials composed of experiences and verbalizations of children).

A.1. Results are based on Metropolitan Achievement Test Scores in grades two and three of the original Craft Project and in grade two of a replication study.

2. Pupils with kindergarten experience generally scored higher than non-kindergarten pupils.

3. Of the two basic methods employed, only the language-experience method scores were consistently significant.

Muinzer, Louis A. Geography and the American language: an approach to literacy. Harvard Educational Review, 34, 1964.

B. The teacher, student, and material being taught are too often divorced from one another.

C. A holistic course in American language, culture and history to instill some sense of orientation and direction in illiterate youth.

Mussen, P.H., Conger, J.J. and Kagan, J. Child Development and Personality. New York, Harper & Row, 1969.

New York Board of Education. Handbook for Language Arts: Pre-K, Kindergarten, Grades One and Two. Curriculum Bulletin Series, No. 8, New York, Board of Education of the City of New York, 1966.

This program is aimed at urban children and suggests ways to adapt instruction and materials to provide for individual differences.

C.1. The course of study for each grade is divided into three areas -
  a. getting ideas through listening, observing and reading,
  b. expressing ideas through speaking and writing,
  c. learning about language.
2. Student and teacher activities are presented in specific teaching plans.
3. A special program for teaching English as a second language is described, including language aims, linguistic patterns used, and suggested approaches to teaching.

New York University Institute for Developmental Studies. Development of a standardized telephone interview for the measurement of language changes in young children. New York, N.Y. University Institute for Developmental Studies, 1968,

Telephone interviews with disadvantaged kindergarten children were taped analyzed, and scored to test the reliability of this technique in obtaining representative speech samples.

A.1. Technique used to determine the effect of familiarity with telephones -
  a. One group of twelve was provided with telephones in the classroom immediately following an initial interview.
  b. Another group of 13 was given telephones following a second interview 3 months later.
  c. A third group of eight was interviewed once but given no additional exposure to the telephone.
2. All 3 groups were interviewed at the end of an 8-month period.
3. Findings -
  a. The telephone interview is a reliable technique for recording representative speech samples and has application to longitudinal studies in which changes in verbal behavior can be analyzed in terms of vocabulary, level, language structure, and articulation.
  b. No significant differences were found in a comparison of the three groups, suggesting that exposure to telephones did not strongly influence the child's performance in the interview.
4. That the 'exposure' to the telephone was generally unstructured and that the children were similar to each other should be considered.

The N.C.T.E. Task Force: Its organization, operation and major findings. In Language Programs for the Disadvantaged. Champaign, Illinois, N.C.T.E. , 1965.

Research. Seven common, widespread fallacies in the thought and practice of most teachers have been:

A.1. A single set of sub-cultural mores guide the behavior of disadvantaged members of our society.
  2. Language programs need to involve only instruction in using Standard English.
  3. All disadvantaged children are apathetic or dull and their classes are seldom exciting.
  4. Discipline is a radically different problem in the inner city classrooms.
  5. Disadvantaged learners cannot engage in inductive, inquiry-centered learning.
  6. Teaching positions in schools for the disadvantaged do not attract able teachers.
  7. Special training is not required for teaching English to the disadvantaged.

C.1. The teacher must accept the child and his language.
  2. A systematic attack on the above seven notions.

II Teacher Education.

Research.

A.1. Teachers and their values are too ethnocentric.
  2. Teachers often fail to see any system of language and culture outside of their own.

C.1. The teacher be knowledgeable about the structure of language (particularly English) and language learning.
  2. Teachers have training in fields like cultural anthropology and urban sociology.
  3. Training in the teaching of reading and literature appropriate to the students.
  4. An interdisciplinary approach to the disadvantaged problem.
  5. A variety of approaches to the problem.

III General recommendations of the task force.

Research based.

C.1. Every reasonable measure be taken to establish especially at the local level, lines of communication and bonds of cooperation among persons, organizations, and institutions working with the disadvantaged.
  2. Children be permitted to operate in the dialect of their community at the lower levels of elementary school education and that direct instruction in the use of Standard informal English be begun no earlier than the intermediate elementary levels.
  3. Oral language receive greater stress in language instruction for the disadvantaged at all educational levels.
  4. All English curriculum for the disadvantaged include "appropriate imaginative literature chosen and presented with these students in mind."
  5. policies of teacher placement be revised where necessary to enable school principals and project directors to play a direct role in recruiting teachers for positions in schools for the disadvantaged.
  6. greater financial support be given to school programs for the

provision of ample materials and personnel.

7. administrators and project directors develop deliberate programs to make available to teachers reports on new research and experimentation.
8. both pre-service and in-service teacher education programs develop courses dealing with the application of current theory to classroom teaching, especially in the study of language.
9. the problem of developing adequate structure and continuity throughout all levels of school... be the responsibility of the school district.
10. teachers of disadvantaged possess at least a working knowledge of developments in structural and transformational grammar, in social dialectology, in psycholinguistics, and in language and cognitive development.

III Pre-School.

Research based.

A.1. Children are born with a potential I.Q. range rather than an I.Q.
  2. How I.Q. develops depends on the child's interaction with his environment.
  3. The disadvantaged child is often retarded in his language development.
  4. The disadvantaged child is usually doomed to failure in the present system.
  5. His ability to compete depends on his communicative skills.
  6. Basic cultural experiences are lacking in low socio-economic groups.
  7. Direct instruction is needed in practicing existing skills and new skills to bring disadvantaged children to the average level.

C.1. The development of skill in language and concept formation be the overriding concern of pre-schools for disadvantaged children.
  2. Every pre-school classroom for disadvantaged children contain a library with a wide selection of children's books.
  3. Pre-school curriculum for disadvantaged children include planned small group instruction in basic vocabulary and statement patterns of conceptual language.
  4. Non-Standard English dialects be a concern at the pre-school level only to the extent that it interferes with the acquisition of fundamental language learnings.

IV Elementary.

Research

A.1. The deficiencies of disadvantaged children fall into 3 categories:
  a. language facility,
  b. conceptual development,
  c. self-concept.
  2. The longer disadvantaged children go unaided, the wider the gap becomes in following grades between their educational development and the development of non-disadvantaged youth.

C.1. Programs for the disadvantaged be geared to local needs.
  2. Disadvantaged first graders not ready for formal reading be

enrolled in an intensive language oriented program.

3. Disadvantaged elementary children with reading deficiencies be placed in a reading-and-language curriculum taught by teachers especially trained to teach reading in relation to language development.
4. Teachers and administrators should question the traditional grade organization.
5. Involve parents of disadvantaged youth in academic programs.
6. Provide good classroom and school libraries.
7. All elementary schools (especially those teaching the disadvantaged) re-evaluate their oral language programs.

V Secondary.

Research based.

A.1. Adjustment to secondary school may be difficult for anyone.
2. It is especially difficult for the disadvantaged student who has been systematically frustrated throughout his previous schooling and who consequently lacks basic skills possessed by others.

C.1. Teachers and administrators inform themselves about recent developments in language instruction.
2. Secondary English programs include oral work in Standard informal English for students with non-standard dialects. Instead of down-grading or attempting to eliminate the students' dialects teachers should teach Standard informal English as a second dialect.

N.C.T.E. Classroom Practices in Teaching English - 1965-66: A Third Report of the Committee to Report Promising Practices in the Teaching of English. Champaign, Illinois, N.C.T.E., 1967.

The 13 articles in this report fall into four categories: programs for the culturally disadvantaged, teaching composition, curriculum revision, and detailed classroom practices.

D.1. Mildred A. Dawson outlines compensatory programs used in Sacramento, California, to prevent drop-outs.
Lois Grose concentrates on the pattern-practice method of teaching standard speech.
Agnes Snyder recounts two classroom practices that engaged the interest of disadvantaged elementary students.
2. Articles pertaining to composition, curriculum revision and teaching techniques are described.

N.C.T.E. Non-Standard Dialect. Champaign, Illinois, 1968.

This booklet contains results of a unified effort by teachers and socio-linguists to 'help students whose native tongue is a Non-Standard variety of English'.

D.1. The monograph is an analysis of dialect of disadvantaged childre in Metropolitan New York and is designed as a model to be adapted to different teaching situations.
2. Section I, 'Content of Instruction' outlines
a. Important linguistic problems of many non-standard speakers-

verb usage, noun forms, pronouns, adjectives and adverbs, sentence patterns, and double negatives.
b. articulation and pronunciation problems.
3. Section II, 'Program of Instruction' presents an outline of sequenced activities-comparing various dialects in the U.S. and suggestions for work with tapes, dialogs, drills and games.

Newton, Eunice Shaed. Verbal destitution; the pivotal barrier to learning. Journal of Negro Education, 29, 1960.

Research.

A. Some pupils are poor readers due to a sort of cultural deprivation rather than any disability.

C.1. A classroom free of derision.
2. A concrete, specific and meaningful learning experience.
3. An enthused teacher.
4. As much exposure as possible to Standard English usage.
5. Obvious, apparent progress.
6. Variety of language development opportunities.
7. synonymity.

O'Brien, Roslyn A. and Lopate, Phillip. Pre-school programs and the intellectual development of disadvantaged children. Urbana, Illinois, Eric Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education, 1968.

Evidence indicates that disadvantaged children are intellectually inferior to middle class children at the time they enter school; and as school continues, the gap widens.

A.1. The disadvantaged child's environment lacks much of the opportunity and stimulation for intellectual growth present in the middle and upper class environments.
2. Compensatory pre-school programs have been created to alleviate the gap.
3. Some early evaluations of the Head Start program indicated which aspects of any such program contribute most to substantial intellectual growth, namely;
   a. A warm, supportive, and stimulating teacher.
   b. A task-oriented program approach
   c. An academically oriented program format.
   d. An emphasis on verbal development.

Ohannessian, Sirarpi. The study of the problems of teaching English to American Indians, Report and Recommendations. Washington D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 1967.

The purpose of the study was to assess the learning and teaching of English in elementary and secondary BIA schools as well as in adult education programs and selected public schools enrolling American Indian students. The twelve man study group was composed of specialists in linguistics and the teaching of English to speakers of other languages, American Indian languages, anthropology, psychology of language learning, and other related and pertinent fields.

C. Recommendations include:
   a. The institution of an independent national advisory council on

Indian education.
b. A re-examination of patterns of schooling for Indian students.
c. Special preparation, recruitment, and retraining of personnel.
d. Research projects.

Olim, Ellis Geo-ge. Relationship of mothers' language styles to the cognitive styles of urban pre-school children. Report #BR-5-8007 and #CRP-S-205, 1965.

There is growing evidence that educational retardation in disadvantaged children sets in long before the child enters school.

A.1. This study set out to:
  a. Develop language scales for the analysis of the language styles of Negro mothers of four social class groups.
  b. Assess social class differences in language styles.
  c. Appraise the relationship between mothers' language styles and their pre-school children's cognitive styles and intellectual competence.
2. Some conclusions and implications -
  a. Social class was a major predictor of conceptual sorting behavior in one instance (descriptive part-whole conceptualization).
  b. The mother's verbal I.Q. was a major predictor of only the cirterion variable, the child's I.Q.
  c. Children who were unable to explain verbally the reason for their conceptual sorts tended to be low in I.Q. and to have low verbal I.Q. mothers. (The author states that this is indirect support for the view that language mediates thought).
  d. Children who did not perform the task tended to be low in I.Q. and to have mothers who were low in verbal I.Q.

C.1. Study suggests that steps should be taken in the pre-school years to expand the linguistic environment of the disadvantaged child. The child should be made aware of the value, intrinsic as well as extrinsic of using language as a cognitive tool.

Olim, Ellis G. and others. Role of Mothers' Language Styles in Mediating Their Pre-school Children's Cognitive Development. School Review, Vol. 75, No. 4, 1967.

This study of mothers' language styles as related to children's cognitive development was conducted with 163 urban Negro mothers from the lower and middle classes and their 4-year old children.

The following conclusions were drawn:

A.1. Significant negative correlation between responses of status oriented mothers and personal or cognitive oriented mothers.
2. Significant negative correlation between responses of mothers using imperatives and those using instructions.
3. Status normative orientation and imperative language were significantly and positively related, while personal-subjective and cognitive-rational orientation and instructive language tended to be positively related.
4. Status-normative oriented mothers had limited language whereas elaborate language was used by personal-subjective and cognitive rational oriented mothers.

5. Children of personal-subjective and cognitive rational oriented mothers performed better.
6. Mothers' language styles were significantly correlated with their children's performance on various cognitive measures.
7. Lower class mothers used imperative language and were status-normative oriented, whereas middle class mothers used intructive language and were personal subjective and cognitive-rational oriented.

C.1. Because of social status differences, intervention must involve social reform.

Olson, Paul A. The arts of language, needed curricula and curriculum development for institutes in the English language arts--language, literature, composition, speech and reading. Paper. USOE Conference, University of Nebraska, 1966.

The conference was held to produce a description of needed research in the area of the in-service retraining of elementary school teachers in the language arts.

D.1. Included in the report are five position papers, five committee reports, and an additional report on special problems of English language arts institutes directed to teachers of the culturally deprived.
2. Generally agreed that institutes on the retraining of teachers in language and linguistic usages should include both scholars and educators.

Osborn, Jean. Teaching a teaching language to disadvantaged children. Urbana, Institute for Research in Exceptional Children, University of Illinois,

The goal of the Bereiter-Engelmann pre-school program is to get disadvantaged children ready for the learning tasks of public school by teaching a teaching language.

C.1. The children begin with a basic pointing-out or identifying statement. When they are able to make a reasonable rendition of the identifying statement, they are taught the negative statement.
2. Categorizations, such as farm animals and wild animals are then introduced.
3. The children learn the various and precise uses of 'and', 'or', 'only', and 'some'.
4. They are next given a series of tasks that deal with verb tenses, verb expansions, and personal pronouns.
5. Results of the Stanford-Binet at the end of two years of instruction indicate that the children's I.Q.'s have risen and that they have been able to use the language of instruction to acquire reading and arithmetic skills.

Osborn, Lynn R. Speech communication and the American Indian high school student. Speech Teacher, Vol. 17, January 1968.

This is a report of a 5-day conference, co-sponsored by Kansas University's Communication Research Center and South Dakota University's Institute for Indian Studies.

The following position statements were drafted by the conferees:
  D.1. A recommended program of speaking and listening training for Indian students.
    2. A recommended program of teacher preparation, including a suggested 4-year course of study with a minimum of 126 semester hours.
    3. Selected major problems relevant to the speech communication needs of American Indian high school students and recommended for immediate and intensive research investigation.

Osser, Harry. Language control in a group of Head Start children. Report #OEO-510. Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore MD.

Twenty Head Start pre-school children were given three language tasks designed to measure their language development.

A.1. A production task required the children to engage in free speech.
  a. Children were asked to describe pictures, answer a question and retell a story.
  b. Speech was analyzed in terms of range and frequency of syntactic structures and number of transformed sentences used and the complexity of the task.
2. An imitation task required the children to repeat 20 sentences using 10 different syntactic structures.
  a. Of 400 correct responses, 281 correct responses were made.
  b. There was evidence that children modified sentences to conform them to their own linguistic system.
3. The sentences used in task number 2 were used in a comprehension task that required the children to point to the picture corresponding to the sentence from a three picture display.
  a. Correct responses numbered 266 out of a possible 400.
  b. Length of sentence was not found to be significantly related to this task.
4. A problem in interpreting this data is choosing criteria that will reliably indicate when the child has control of a particular syntactic structure.

Osser, Harry. The syntactic structures of 5-year-old culturally deprived children. Washington D.C. N.E.A., 1962.

Through analysis of transformational grammar, syntactic structures of twenty 5-year-old disadvantaged Negro children in Baltimore were compared to those of a group of middle class white nursery school children in Boston.

A.1. Dialect differences were minimized by a concept of functional equivalence (equating statements which have different words but the same meaning).
2. The total number of sentences produced, the total number of different syntactic structures used, and an average sentence complexity score were taken as indices of linguistic performance.
3. Results -
  a. A substantial difference in structure use was found between the two groups with the Boston group using many more syntactic structures.
  b. The Negro group had a wide range of difference in complexity

and number of syntactic structures used.

c. The large differences in Negro group suggest that environment plays a major role in language development.

4. It is possible that the degree of immaturity in language development in early childhood is significant in the child's general cognitive development.

Ott, Elizabeth. Linguistic build-ups in English for disadvantaged Spanish-speaking children. (Bilingual Research Study). Report #BR-5-0249-10. Contract OEC-6-10-108. 1967.

The language lessons in this report use simple science concepts and an oral-aural approach to develop linguistic build-ups in English for Spanish-speaking children.

C.1. Lessons designed to develop fluency in English for self-identification and daily communication of basic needs.
2. Short sentences in the present tense are taught in a brief dialog.
3. The dialog is carried on first between the individual pupil and the teacher and then the entire group participates for a second set of simple sentences as in dialog form.

Ott, Elizabeth. The language and reading education program of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Paper. Working Conference on Research and Activity in the Language Arts for the Pre-primary/Primary Culturally Diverse Non-English Speaking Child, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1967.

Materials for this program are to be especially designed to attack the language problems of linguistically handicapped children of the Southwest.

C. Linguistic characteristics which cause learning difficulties have been identified in order to evaluate the program. The following areas are proposed as bases for formulating hypotheses which will be tested later.
  a. Primacy of oral language development,
  b. Meaningful content,
  c. Language skills, and
  d. Cultural understanding.

Ott, Elizabeth. Basic education for Spanish-speaking disadvantaged pupils. 1968.

This bilingual education program of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory is also applicable to teaching French Acadians and Negro Americans.

C.1. The author feels the strength of the program is that it helps children to become 'intellectually curious, sensitive to opportunities around them, and friendly and responsive human beings'.
2. Reading in both languages is introduced early and is based on what the children have learned to understand and use orally.
3. Subject-matter is taught in Spanish and English at separate periods during the day.
4. A description of Horn's Language Research project and the Ott Study is followed by test data.

Ozmon, Howard A. Jr. A realistic approach to the writing of children's textbooks for deprived areas. Elementary English, 37, 1960.

B.1. The reading program in a school in a deprived area is vital toward those children's development.

2. Teachers of deprived children argue that the texts and materials are of little value to these children because it doesn't relate to them.

C.1. Writing relevant to the lives and experiences in children of deprived areas.

Pascual, Henry. Teaching Spanish to native speakers of Spanish in New Mexico. 1967.

A pilot project at Pecos, New Mexico, was designed for teaching Spanish as the mother tongue and English as a second language.

C.1. In developing the project, 2 assumptions were made.
   a. By developing language skills in their native tongue, Spanish-speaking children will be better equipped to progress in the study of a second language.
   b. By developing literacy in Spanish, the bilingual student will be better prepared to cope with the entire curriculum.

2. The five objectives of the study were:
   a. Develop the language skills of understanding, speaking, reading and writing.
   b. Develop appreciation and awareness of Hispanic culture.
   c. Broaden economic opportunities of individuals.
   d. Use a pilot classroom as a demonstration center for methods and techniques of teaching Spanish to Spanish-speakers.
   e. Use results obtained to initiate curriculum changes in New Mexico.

Past, Ray and others. Bilingualism--from the viewpoint of recruitment and preparation of bilingual teachers. Paper. Conference of Southwest Council of Foreign Language Teachers, El Paso, Texas, 1966.

Teachers of English as a second language must be prepared to communicate interculturally as well as linguistically.

C.1. Teachers of bilingual students should understand
   a. The nature of language.
   b. Kinds of interference from one language to another.
   c. Thought processes and language acquisition.
   d. Language and its relation to concept development.
   e. Phonology, morphology and syntax.
   f. Methods and techniques of language instruction.
   f. Materials for language instruction.

2. The universities could render a greater service to the biligual communities by affording student teachers the needed supervised field experiences in second language capacities.

Patten, Thomas H. Jr. andCClark, Gerald E. Jr. Literacy Training and Job placement of Hard-Core Unemployed Negroes in Detroit. The Journal of Human Resources, Vol. 3, No. 1, Winter 1968.

Description of a 1965 study to test the relative effectiveness of the initial teaching alphabet (ITA) a.d traditional orthographic approaches to reading among 53 card-core functionally illiterate, unemployed men in Detroit, two-thirds of which were Negroes.

A.1. Differences in the appropriateness of the two media.
  2. In the spring of 1966, a follow-up study of 45 trainess was conducted to determine the job placement and general social adjustment.
    a. 12 of the 48 men who finished the literacy program were working.
    b. Many of remainder were continuing in literacy training programs.
  3. Important effect upon the self-image of the trainee.
    a. Improved personal appearance. They felt they were better human beings.
  4. Participants were forced to develop a daily regimen by virtue of program participation.
  5. The achievement of literacy and job placement remain distant goals for the hard-core unemployed.

Pederson, Lee A. Social dialects and the disadvantaged. In Language Programs for the Disadvantaged. Champaign, Illinois, N.C.T.E., 1965.

A. Language problems fall into 3 areas which are:
  a. True verbal destitution.
  b. Full but non-standard language development.
  c. Unconceptualized experience and underdeveloped language.

Pederson, Lee A. Middle class negro speech in Minneapolis. Orbis, 16, 1967.

Research.

A.1. There exists a set of pronunciation differences which are distinctly Negro (in Minneapolis) when compared with economically similar Caucasian and Indian groups.
  2. Lower class Negro speech appears to be influencing the Indian groups in Minneapolis.
  3. Middle class Negro speech seems to be tending toward a more Standard English speech.
C.1. Further research recommended.

Pean, Albar A.. Teaching content in Spanish in the elementary school. Paper. Annual Conference of Southwest Council of Foreign Language Teachers, El Paso, Texas, 1967.

Research in second language learning supports the belief that language study should begin as early as kindergarten or first grade.

D.1. It is assumed that by achieving competency, maturity, and oral and written fluency in Spanish, the learnings acquired for Spanish can be transferred to the task of learning English.
  2. Success in Spanish may be a strong motivating force to do well in other areas of learning.

3. The Texas University San Antonio Language Research Project was initiated to develop oral language, both English and Spanish, through an intensive audio-lingual approach.
4. It is hoped that the results of this study can provide substantial evidence to support the hypothesis that audio-lingual and carefully sequenced instruction in the native language of the learner produces measurable academic success.

Phillips, Judith. The Effects of the examiner and the testing situation upon the performance of culturally deprived children. Phase I-- Intelligence and Language Ability Test Scores as a Function of the Race of the Examiner. Final Report. Report #BR-6-1421-CARCEE-Vol-1, Contract OEC-6-10-193. 1966.

Post-test intelligence scores of young Negro children obtained following a 6-month language development project were compared according to the race and sex of the examiner.

1. Pre-test scores indicated that Negro examiners produced higher Stanford-Binet I.Q. scores than white examiners. A similar difference was found for scores on the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA)
2. Present study showed no differences associated with race and sex of the examiner and sex of child on the Stanford-Binet post-test scored.
3. White examiners produced significantly higher scores than Negro examiners with 160 ITPA post-test results.
4. The greatest difference between Negro and white examiners occurred on the ITPA vocal encoding sub-test, where whites produced more spontaneous vocalization.

Piaget, Jean. The Language and Thought of the Child. New York, Harcourt, Brace and World, 1926.

Pierce-Jones, John. Annual Research Report of Completed and Incomplete Investigations for National Head Start Evaluation. Report #OEO-4115. 1968.

A list of nine completed investigations and two progress reports of incomplete investigations make up this report.

D.1. One incomplete project is concerned with bilingual instruction and other compensatory education programs for Mexican-American children in the southwest.

2. Objective of other incomplete project is to examine relationships between motivational variables and retention processes.

Pittsburgh Public Schools. Standard Speech Development Program: 1968 Report. Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh Public Schools, 1968.

This program of the Pittsburgh Public Schools was designed to give junior high school students control of Standard English speech through oral pattern drills based on particular phonetic or grammatical structures of Standard English.

C.1. By the end of 1967-68 school year, pattern drills were part of the English curriculums in 37 Pittsburgh schools and an evaluation of program has begun.

2. For the evaluation, 23 randomly selected teachers were interviewed to determine their understanding of program objectives, their actual classroom use of pattern drills, and the effectiveness of in-service training.
3. Findings -
   a. Teachers were unable to identify valid program objectives.
   b. Discrepancies existed between recommended time allotments and actual classroom practice.
   c. No appreciable changes in teachers' attitudes or procedures resulted from in-service training.
4. At the time of this progress report, the program is faced with the task of developing suitable instruments for measuring student achievement and the reexamination of teachers' attitudes and practices.

Poots, Alfred M. 2nd and Mamie Sizemore. Developing curriculum for Indian children. Adams State College, Alamoso, Colorado. Center for Cultural Studies, 1964.

This workshop report was prepared as a guide for teachers of Indian children in the four corners area of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico and Utah.

D.1. The stated purposes are to provide insights into problems of educating these children and to provide knowledge of their different cultural backgrounds.
2. Special emphasis is placed upon developing the ability to communicate effectively in English. Several methods for teaching English are described.
3. Methods of teaching social studies, arithmetic and science and problems of intelligence and achievement testing are discussed.

C.1. These children should be tested only when a definite purpose is to be served and then with great care, since most standardized tests do not indicate accurately the capabilities of Indian children.

Potts, Alfred M. 2nd. Knowing and educating the disadvantaged, an annotated bibliography. Report #CRP-S-173, Adams State College, Alamoso, Colorado, 1965.

D. 'Knowing and Educating the Disadvantaged' is an annotated bibliography of materials related to the education of migrants or the economically disadvantaged. It is arranged by both topic and title indexes.

Pryor, Guy C. Evaluation of the Bi-Lingual Project of Harlandale Independent School District, San Antonio, Texas. In the First Grades of Four Elementary Schools during 1966-67 School Year. 1967.

This evaluation report presents comparative data from the testing program used to establish the effectiveness of bilingual education when compared to traditional English only instruction.

C.1. Data also includes behavioral observations by the teacher, attendance and promotion data, and pupil history.

2. Statistical comparisons are made on all test results of the pre- and post-testing periods.
3. Results reflect favorable on bilingual instruction, and recommendations were made to expand and continue research in the program.

Ramsey, Wallace and Marguerite Boercker. The influence of a Head Start program on reading achievement.

The writers discuss the influence of an 8-week Head Start program during the summer prior to the first grade on the reading achievement of 152 pupils.

A.1. Standardized tests results indicated that the Head Start program achieved success in preparing children for academic learning.

C.1. Some radical approach to teaching reading to children whose normal dialect is non-Standard English is needed.

2. Substantial further experimentation and study are necessary for Head Start to achieve its full promise.

Randolph, H.Helen. Urban Education Bibliography: An Annotated Listing. New York, Center for Urban Education, New York, 1968.

An annotated review of literature which brings together research reports, articles, books, and other publications concerning urban education.

D.1. Contents are designed for researchers, teachers, students, administrators, and policymakers.

2. References are from material produced from September 1964 through December 1965.

3. Approximately 1,000 annotations are arranged under subject headings. Both a subject listing and Library of Congress listing are included.

Rankin, Paul T. Jr. Evaluation of the Basic Reading Demonstration Project, 1966-67. Detroit, Detroit Public Schools, 1968.

Study was conducted to determine the effectiveness of six approaches to beginning reading instruction (basal, linguistic, phonetic, programmed reading, i/t/a and unifon) in schools serving educationally disadvantaged children and to determine effectiveness of lay aides in project classrooms.

A.1. Subjects were approximately 4,000 pupils in primary one and two classes of 19 Detroit public schools.

2. The means and standard deviations of achievement and aptitude test scores were computed for each experimental treatment group. Teacher evaluations of lay aides' services were analyzed by response frequency distributions.

3. Results -
   a. With few exceptions, reading achievement means of all treatment groups were below grade level in terms of national norms.
   b. With primary two pupils, i/t/a followed by the basal approach to reading instruction produced highest mean achievement scores.
   c. Teachers' responses indicated that lay aides provided valuable

classroom assistance.

4. Conclusions reagarding the relative effectiveness of the various methods cannot be drawn until June 1968 achievement test scores are available.

Raph, Jane Beasley. Language research study--Project Head Start. Development of methodology for obtaining and analyzing spontaneous verbalizations used by pre-kindergarten children in selected Head Start programs - a pilot study. Report #OEO-535. Rutgers, State University, New Brunswick, N.J., 1965.

This study was designed to develop methodological approaches for obtaining continuous expressive language samples. It also was to consider means for analyzing the samples that would yield qualitative and quantitative methods.

1. Four investigators were assigned to a different Head Start classroom to generally encourage the children to talk and kept continuous, detailed, narrative descriptions of functional language used by the children.
2. During the last half of the program, children's language response to specific stimulus situations were tape recorded, with the attempt to determine a representative range from most to least verbal children.

Regan, Timothy. TEFL and the culturally deprived. 1967.

Two problems are identified in teaching culturally deprived adults --the cultural disorientation of the learner, and the complex problems of learning English as a second language.

B.1. An atmosphere of understanding and the adoption of programmed materials designed with the culturally different in mind are seen as trends toward alleviating cultural disorientation.

2. Learning a second language is difficult, since motivational factors are different for adults, and time, exposure, and practice periods are less than in learning the first language as a child.

Reissman, Frank. The Strategy of Style. In Smiley, M.B. & Miller H.L. Policy Issues in Urban Education. New York, Free Press, 1968.

In studying theories of learning, more emphasis should be placed upon understanding and developing idiosyncratic styles of human learning, as opposed to focussing upon abstract concepts derived from animal experiments.

1. The disadvantaged child may be characterized as a visual-physical learner who learns in a slow, one track fashion.
2. Teacher education courses emphasize general styles of learning with little consideration given to individual styles. The suggestion that distributive learning is better may work well for some, but be inadequate for one who takes a long while to warm up and who will require more concentrated practice.
3. A person's style is formed early in life. To promote learning, it is necessary to find the strengths in a style and attempt to minimize the weaknesses.

a. The guidance counselor or teacher should aid a child in becoming aware of his style.
b. The counselor may ask a child to describe what happens when he sits down to study.
c. The counselor or teacher may then assist the child in discovering the positive aspects of his style.

4. Role playing followed by related reading may be used to teach reading to a child whose style does not include reading.
5. Low income youngsters like to learn through games rather than tests.
6. In areas of weakness, our primary aim should be functioning on a minimal level of adequacy so that weaknesses will not destroy strengths.
7. Inherent in everyone's style are certain strengths and the Achilles heel. The issue in learning is related to how one gets to the weaknesses, and how one utilized the strengths.

Robb, Juanita. Syllabus for the teaching of reading to disadvantaged yough. Monmouth, Oregon. Training Center for Teachers of Migrant and Disadvantaged. 1967.

This syllabus is designed to make teachers aware of the developmental sequence of language arts skills and to present ways and means to remedy specific disabilities.

C.1. Problems of diagnosis include the investigation of physical deterrents, language disabilities and the assessment of the total picture of potential ability to learn.
2. Informal inventories are frequently more helpful than standardized tests results.
3. Setting up a remedial program depends on relating diagnostic findings to performance demands.
4. Programmed materials and the linguistics approach can be used successfully if the teacher is skilled.

Rodrigues, Armando. Bilingual education. Paper. National Conference on Educational Opportunties for the Mexican-American, Austin, Texas, 1968.

Bilingual education is the process of instructing the child in his native language in some or all the curricular areas while he is learning English in the public school.

B.1. Process prevents academic retardation due to a lack of proficiency in the English language.
2. Gives each student a base for success in the world of work, while preserving and enriching the cultural and human resources of a people.

C. Recommendations -
a. Pilot programs and demonstration projects in bilingual education initiated under Title 7 of the ESEA might illustrate how other federal assistance programs could better be used to support similar educational undertakings.
b. More emphasis on inservice programs in bilingual teacher education.

Rogers, John R. et. al. Linguistics in Reading Instruction. Mississippi University, School of Education. 1965.

Practical suggestions for teaching reading are reported by participants of an Institute on the application of linguistics to spelling and reading.

C.1. Chapter I Phonemics and orthography in reading instruction.
  2. Chapter II Morphology in Reading instruction.
  3. Chapter III Syntax in reading instruction.
  4. Chapter IV Dialectology in reading instruction.
    a. Deals with problems arising from the fact that language patterns vary from area to area and from cultural level to cultural level.
    b. Terminology is simplified for creative teacher seeking to develop child's background in oral language in order to facilitate his beginning reading development.
    c. Emphasis upon helping child feel comfortable with the language he brings to school, and upon developing language understandings and appreciation to fit the classroom situation.

Rohwer, William D. Jr. and others. Learning efficiency as a function of depiction, verbalization, grade and social class. 1967.

Learning efficiency as a function of depiction, verbalization, grade level and social class was explored with 384 kindergarten, first, third and sixth grade children from middle and lower-class areas

A.1. The children were asked to learn a list of 24 paired associates which were presented pictorially. The first manipulated factor, depiction, had two levels 'still' in which the objects in each pair were stationary when filmed and 'action' in which the objects were moving when photographed.
  2. To test the second factor, verbalization, the experimenter either named aloud the objects in each pair or uttered a sentence containing the names of the two objects.

Rosen, Carl L. and Ortego, Philip D. Problems and Strategies in Teaching the Language Arts to Spanish-Speaking Mexican-American Children. Paper. Conference on Teacher Education for Mexican-Americans. New Mexico University, 1969.

Attention is given to curriculum considerations, metholodogies, and innovations for effecting success in language arts development for these children.

C.1. Four major strategies include:
    a. Readying the child for the common curriculum.
    b. Second language learning.
    c. Reading instructional approaches.
    d. Bilingual education.
  2. Recommendations -
    a. A commitment to the need for a newer way of thinking and working with these children and a feel for the problem.
    b. A changed approach to planning, decision-making, and teaching resulting in a different teaching leadership style.
    c. A broadening of the base of participation by opening society's institutions at all levels to all of its peoples.

Ross, Frank E. For the disadvantaged student - a program that really swings. English Journal, 54, 1965.

Experience based.

A.1. Students aren't usually recognized as individuals.
  2. Disadvantaged or different students are not given the individual attention needed in terms of materials, programs, and teachers' attitudes to succeed.
C.1. Changing of the above two points recommended.
  2. An aural-oral approach to advancing students to the level needed to attain necessary language skills.

Ruark, Roger D. The Understanding of Basic Reading Concepts by First Grade Children from Indian and non-Indian Cultural Groups. Dissertation, University of South Dakota, 1967.

A comparative study of the understanding of basic reading concepts among children in the first grade from culturally discrete groups. Differences also measured on the basis of sex and intelligence as a culture-free instrument.
A sample of 90 Indian and 90 white first grade children from ten cities and towns in South Dakota was equally divided on the basis of six, ethnic group membership and geographic locale. Groups were identified as urban-white, urban-Indian, reservation white-reservation Indian, rural-white and rural-Indian.

A.1. Main differences between reservation white and Indian children on total mean scores on the Test of Conceptual Understandings adjusted for the factor of intelligence.
  2. Significant values were found in all differences in mean scores
    a. Among geographical locales,
    b. Ethnic groups within locales, and
    c. The effect of interaction between ethnic groups and locales.
  3. The findings supported the conclusion tht insofar as the devised test was a measure of understanding of basic reading concepts, there were,
    a. real differences in the understanding of these concepts by first-grade children from six culturally discrete groups,
    b. this was true regardless of whether the factor of intelligence was statistically controlled.

Ruddell, Robert B. and Graves, Barbara W. Socio-ethnic status and the language achievement of first grade children. Elementary English, 45, 1968.

The objective of this study was to investigate the relationship between syntactical language development and the socio-ethnic status of beginning first-grade children.

A.1. The subjects were nineteen Caucasian children (High Group) selected at random from levels I and II of the Minnesota Scale for Paternal Occupation and nineteen Negro children (Low Group) from levels VI and VII of the Minnesota Scale.
  2. The Test of Syntax, originally developed by Fraser, Bellugi and Brown was administered individually to the entire randomly selected group.

3. On the test items which were familiar in syntactic structure to both groups, there was a significant positive relationship between error rate and socio-ethnic status. However, when the error rate was compared on three items unfamiliar to both groups there was no significant difference between the two groups.
4. The Low Group made thirteen times as many errors in agreement of subject and verb as the High Group. In the omission of the auxiliary very is or are with the -ing form of the verb, the Low Group made 2.6 times as many errors as the High Group. In the use of possessive pronouns, the Low Group made five times as many errors as the High Group.
5. The contrast in error rate on familiar items for the two groups suggests that the performance of the High Group was influenced by the adult language models of their pre-school years as well as by the amount of practice they had in using Standard English in a variety of situations.
6. The value of rich and varied classroom experiences designed to develop Standard English competence of disadvantaged students becomes evident. The role of the teacher as a language model can be a crucial one.

C.1. Consideration should be given to the teaching of Standard English as a second dialect. In this way, the students can preserve their 'home' or first dialect and use it in situations for which it is more appropriate, while they learn to use Standard English to achieve increased success in school. This approach should also enable students to establish a broader base for future social and economic mobility.

Ryckman, David B. A comparison of information processing abilities of middle and lower class Negro kindergarten boys, in Studies in Language and Language Behavior. Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1967.

Fifty middle class and 50 lower class kindergarten boys were individually administered tests designed to assess specific information processing abilities.

A.1. The 8 instruments used included three standardized tests (Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities, The Beery-Buktenica Developmental Form Sequence, and The Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test) and five unstandardized instruments.
2. Component analysis of 19 variables produced five reasonable meaningful components.
3. The evidence suggests that the major differentiating characteristic between the middle and lower class is general language ability.
4. The findings noted in the study appear to support strongly the position that cultural deprivation is essentially language deprivation.
5. Using a definition based on language variables, rather than socio-economic variables appears to be advantageous in terms of identification and remedial or compensatory educational programming.

C.1. The definition should be based on language usage, rather than on such language variables as vocabulary. Educational definition, diagnosis, and program planning are discussed.

Salisbury, Lee H. Role conflict in native communication. Washington D.C., Georgetown University TESOL Institute of Languages and Linguistics, 1968.

The author describes our prime educational aim in Alaska as an effort to help the native to become an autonomous, productive member of the larger society which he is entering.

B.1. Teachers of English as a second language are teaching the culture that the language expresses at the same time that they teach the code itself.
  2. It is easy to regard any cultural group which has no written language, survives on a subsistence conomy, and lives in virtual isolation as primitive, and hence, childlike.
  3. It is also easy to regard the process of learning English as the process of maturing from a childlike to an adult status.
  4. When the Alaska native child learns English from a teacher who regards him and his parents as children, he cannot help but feel that the role of the child is strictly connected with the use of his language.
  5. The teacher should realize that each student has a unique contribution to make to the world; when each student comes to realize this himself, the learning process has meaning.

Sapon, Stanley M. Contingency management in the modification of verbal behavior in disadvantaged children. Paper, American Psychological Association, 1967.

In a specially organized nursery school setting, disadvantaged children between two and one-half and three and one-half years of age, experienced contingency mangagement procedures to modify verbal behavior.

A.1. Requisite antecedent behaviors were established in each child with reinforcement provided by the dispensation of metal washers.
  2. Topographical accuracy of the child's responses were encouraged through the simplest, most direct controls. Responses were then brought under control of other, more realistic stimuli.
  3. A criterion test was administered and the desired behavior was reached with all subjects after a mean of six sessions.
  4. It was concluded that:
    a. Disadvantaged children respond to contingency management procedures as well as middle class children.
    b. The strategies involved in requisite antecedent behavior training and transfers to general group activities appear to be sound.
    c. Verbal behavior in very young children appears to be amenable to modfication under contingency management procedures.

Sawyer, Janet. Dialects, education, and the contributions of linguistics. In Language Programs for the Disadvantaged. Champaign, Illinois, N.C.T.E., 1965.

B.1. Hypothetical points are:

a. Negro English etc., are merely English dialects and not different languages.
b. Linguistics may contribute to teaching of Standard English in terms of dialect study and making regional prestige dialects explicit.

Scarth, Peter and Regan, Timothy. ESOL and the Mexican-American. Linguistic Reporter, 1968.

Federal literacy programs for some 1,500,000 Mexican-American migrant workers have been somewhat unsuccessful because they have disregarded the learner's psychological set and cultural heritage.

A.1. Schools continue to insist on all English classes in spite of research which shows that children learn to read and write English faster and more effectively if first taught their native Spanish.
2. The mental confusion and incomplete mastery of the two languages result in:
    a. Poor achievement on diagnostic tests and in classwork
    b. High drop-out rates.
    c. Illiteracy (often in both Spanish and English).
3. Signifying a 'brighter' future in the field of ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) are:
    a. Greater efforts at coordination by national agencies.
    b. Innovative programs.
    c. The use of professionally trained ESOL specialists.

Serwer, Blanche L. and AlbertJ. Harris. How first-grade teachers spend their teaching language arts to disadvantaged children. Paper. AERA, 1966.

The authors report results of a study of time allocated to language arts by 48 teachers of 1600 disadvantaged urban children in New York City.

A.1. Twelve classes each were assigned to one of four methods used in the Craft Project -
    a. Basal reader with phonovisual techniques.
    b. Basal reader
    c. Language experience
    d. Language experience with audiovisual supplementation.
2. Teacher logs were completed daily.
3. Results -
    a. Teacher emphasized appropriate activities for five reading activities and 10 supportive language arts activities, but they differed significantly in the time spent for six of these activities.
    b. The significant differences were in the direction consistent with the assigned methods of instruction.
    c. Example of teacher logs are appended.

Shields, Virginia. Oral expression, remedial speech and English for the migrant child, grades one-twelve. Naples, Florida,. Collier Co. Board of Public Instruction.

This document analyzes a program of oral expression in Collier County, Florida.

C.1. The program was designed to assist migrant children in –
  a. Speaking English fluently,
  b. Using words correctly
  c. Developing correct speech habits.
  d. Encouraging speech and language interest, self-evaluation, and improvement.
2. 'The Miami Linguistic Readers' and the "Fries American English Series' are utilized.
3. Publication presents outlines which include language development, choral reading and speaking experiences for grades one-twelve. (Fundamentals of speech are substituted for choral reading in the high school grades).

Shuy, Roger W. Detroit speech: careless, awkward, and inconsistent, or systematic, graceful and regular. Elementary English, 45, May 1968.

The assumption that there is a single universally accepted norm for English is both fallacious and dangerous.

A.1. Charges that inner city Negroes are slovenly, non-verbal, inexact or lazy in their speech, do little to get at the nature of the language problems of the disadvantaged child.
2. In the past decade, dialectologists have turned their attention to the cities to study the relationship between English and social stratification.
3. The Detroit Dialect Study involved some 700 people, selected randomly, from four groups:
  a. Fourth to sixth graders.
  b. Secondary level students (older siblings of a)
  c. Parents of a and b.
  d. Grandparents of a and b.
4. The sample included lower, middle and upper-income residents, white and Negro, young and old, male and female, Christian and Jew.

B.1. The data gathered from the Detroit study should reveal a number of exciting things, including the following:
  a. That each social dialect has a structure quite adequate for its users. 'Omissions', if they exist, are not merely careless. Variations in tense may be quite patterned. Apparently 'unnecessary repetition' may within that system be quite necessary.
  b. That there are certain features of pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary which can be considered indices of social stratification. These indices will become the focus of the English teachers' attention.
  c. That in most cases it will be better not to destroy a lower class dialect, for its user may need it to survive in certain social situations. Instead it may be best to add to it a new social dialect which will be useful for getting ahead in the world.
  d. What in order to build this second dialect, it is best to know the structure of both the lower class dialect and the target dialect.

Shuy, Roger W. A study of social dialects in Detroit. Final Report # BR-6-1347. Contract OEC-3-6-061347-0636. 1968.

This document comprises a report on goals of the research, field methods, analytical procedures, structural frequencies, computer based phonological analysis, and some sociolinguistic implications for the teaching of Standard English.

A.1. The research design included -
  a. Randomly selecting 700 Detroit residents of four major age groups.
  b. Developing a suitable questionnaire.
  c. Soliciting three styles of speech (conversational, single response style, and reading style) through interviews.
  d. Securing background information about each informant (sex, race, educations, etc.)
  e. Analyzing linguistic data and correlating it with sociological information.
2. Particular attention was given to determining the attitudes of local teachers toward the language used by their students, the role of linguistics in teaching Standard English as a second dialect, and the definition and importance of functional bi-dialectalism.

Shuy, Roger W. A selective bibliography on social dialects. Linguistic Reporter, June 1968.

The purpose of this bibliography is 'to acquaint linguists, sociologists, and educators with a representative selection of linguistically oriented readings on the available theory, design, research, and pedagogical applications in the area of social dialects.'

D.1. The 46 references are divided into three categories -
  a. Theoretical and programmatic aspects.
  b. Research reports.
  c. Pedagogical applications for the classroom.
  A brief annotation describing the content and scope of each reference is included.

Shuy, Roger W. Bonnie and Clyde Tactics in English Teaching. Paper. National Council of Teachers of English Conference, 1968.

The author describes three current approaches to the problems of non-Standard English and examines the motivations behind their recommendations.

B.1. 'Eradications' - traditional negative correction based on ethnocentric prescription.
2. 'Biloquialism' - offers student the option of adjusting phonology grammar, and lexicon between home dialect and standard.
3. Third approach is to give standard speakers a better understanding of non-standard speech. Designed as training to tolerate diverse language forms rather than as gaining a useful level of proficiency.

C.1. The author proposes that English teachers should ask themselves:
  a. Is what I am teaching the most important thing for my students?
  b. Is my teaching unbigoted?
  c. Am I giving my students the most useful alternatives for their self-fulfillment?

  d. Am I using the most dynamic and timely principles and data for understanding the system of language?
  e. Is my language teaching developing healthy attitudes toward human rights?

Shuy, Roger W. and others. Field techniques in an urban language study. Washington D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 1968.

This is a report of the methodology employed by the Detroit Dialect Study staff in their survey of Detroit speech, 1966-67.

D.1. Authors discuss general principles of fieldwork and give such detailed descriptions of their work as they feel would be useful in similar projects.
  2. General objectives of study -
    a. To describe the specialized linguistic features of the various sub-cultures of Detroit.
    b. To determine the most efficient methods of gathering data on urban language patterns and of storing, retrieving and analyzing such data.
    c. To provide accurate and useful data for educational programs.

Singer, Harry. Bilingualism and elementary education. Modern Language Journal, 40, 1956.

Research.

A.1. Bilingualism where in two languages are of equal status at pre-school age are detrimental to a child's development.
  2. A single language must be a dominant means of communication for the most efficient instructional purposes.
  3. Students tend to learn a second language to the degree of proficiency of their own language.
  4. In areas where the school and community languages differ, bilinguals are underdeveloped.

Sivadesh, Evangelina Arana. Mixtecan children at school. Paper. Symposium on Cross Cultural Cognitive Studies, AERA, 1968.

Seven elementary schools were established in Southern Oaxaca, Mexico, by the National Indian Institute, with teachers from the local area and instruction in Mixteco, the tribal tongue.

C.1. Spanish was taught using conversational techniques.
  2. Age and sex were crucial variables in learning styles.
    a. Having done strenuous work, older boys had difficulty in writing due to poor hand muscle control.
    b. Older girls displayed a facility for writing attributed to muscular co-ordination attained learning to spin, weave and sew.
  3. Older students of both sexes were extremely timid.
  4. Results -
    a. Within 4 months, the children knew the rudiments of reading and writing and within 9 months most of them could read and write their own language and Spanish.
    b. Results were attributed to teachers who were familiar with local cultural patterns and primers that related lesson material to the children's daily lives.

Sizemore, Mamie. A New Approach to Second Language Teaching. Arizona State Department of Public Instruction, Phoenix, 1962.

The author presents the principles of modern linguistic science as they relate to teaching English as a second language.

D. Areas covered include:
1. The problems of bilingual children.
2. Importance of a friendly classroom climate.
3. Cultural conflicts in teaching Indian children.
4. Curriculum overviews.
5. The role of the linguist in the classroom.
6. An overview of teaching English as a second language.
7. Comparisons between English and the Navajo and Spanish languages.

Sizemore, Mamie. Teaching reading to the bilingual child. Phoenix, Arizona State Department of Public Instruction, 1963.

Newer approaches to the teaching of second languages as applied to English reading instruction for Indian and Mexican-American students are explored.

C.1. Special emphasis is given to the unique cultural and educational problem faced by these children.
2. Considerable emphasis is given to the development of speaking and listening communication skills to facilitate learning to read.
3. A detailed review of phonics is included.
4. Specific reference is made to reading skills which should be mastered by all reading students.

Sizemore, Mamie and others. Colorado Indian Education Workshop Papers. Alamoso College, Adams State College, 1967.

The articles are concerned with the problems of social, cultural, moral, emotional, and intellectual development of bilingual-bicultural children, as a meaningful curriculum is developed to correlate with their social and cultural environment.

Sobodzian, Evelyn B. Use of the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities as a readiness measure. Paper. International Reading Association Conference, 1968.

The test designed for children aged 3-9 is of diagnostic value to kindergarten and first-grade teachers, especially in disadvantaged areas.

C.1. From its use, the teacher can determine:
   a. Background inadequacies.
   b. Differences between the level of a child's ideas and his ability to express them.
   c. Deviations in auditory and visual abilities.
   d. Digress of self-confidence in language usage.
   e. Differences in hearing and speaking vocabularies.
   f. Articulation problems.
2. Tests results enable the teacher to create programs that develop readiness on the basis of individual needs.

Smiley, Majorie B. Gateway English: teaching English to disadvantaged students. English Journal, 54, 1965.

B.1. Disadvantaged youth are usually systematically frustrated by rather than aided by the present school system due to the youths' differences in background, culture, and experience.

C.1. A systematic approach to language learning more basic and complete than that given the advantaged student.
2. Application of dialect study and divorcing morality from correct Standard English.
3. Reading materials appropriate to the students involved.

Smiley, Marjorie B. Development of reading and English language materials for grades 7-9 in depressed urban areas. Final Report #BR-5-0687. Congract OEC-SAE-3-10-015, 1968.

The Hunter College Project English Curriculum Center (1962-68) developed and field-tested 14 units in English language arts for junior high students who were reading an average of 2 years below grade.

C.1. The anthologies which served as core of the units dealt with human interest themes and included selections about minority groups.
2. The methodology emphasized active learning and learning sequences which would aid students to discover concepts and principles.
3. Special attention was given to study and test-taking skills.
4. Approximately 5000 students participated in field testing in New York, Ohio, Florida and California.
5. Reading scores generally showed that students in experimental program achieved gains equal to or better than comparable to control groups.

Smith, Anne M. Indian Education in New Mexico. Albuquerque, Division of Research, Department of Political Science, University of New Mexico, 1968.

Percentage of Indian children in New Mexico public schools is increasing, but drop-out rates remain high and a low level of academic achievement persists.

C.1. Effort must be made to increase Johnson-O'Malley funds for Indian students, and more detailed accounting procedures should be required.
2. Schools of Education should include courses in linguistics to prepare teachers to teach English as a second language.
3. Indian education must be based on a philosophy that respects and recognizes cultural differences.

Smith, Marguerite. English as a second language for Mexican-Americans. Paper. National Conference on Educational Opportunities for Mexican-Americans. Austin, Texas, 1968.

In order to plan an adequate curriculum, there must be a clear understanding of the academic and cultural objectives to be met.

B.1. The implementation of the objectives will be influenced by the students, the teachers, the school, and the community.
  2. The primary objective in teaching the Mexican-American is to develop his ability to communicate in English.
  3. Aural-oral mastery is logically gained through language arts.
  4. The author includes poems, games, songs and structured oral drills for grade 1, and indicates areas of curricular importance for grades 2-8.
  5. Lately there has been a move toward teaching Spanish-speaking students in Spanish with an attendant emphasis on their cultural inheritance.

Spiegler, Charles G. If only Dickens had written about hotrods. English Journal, 54, 1965.

Experiment.

A.1. Reading material is not well geared to the student and is even less relevant to the disadvantaged student;
  2. The use of reading material gauged to students' interests highly increases the amount of reading done and interest taken in language skills.

C.1. Giving students reading material which is directly relevant and of interest to them.

Stanchfield, Jo. M. The use of original instructional materials as a stimulus for improved reading. Paper. National Reading Conference, 1966.

A variety of reading materials and methods were developed to determine their affect on the reading achievement of first graders.

A.1. Materials developed included reading readiness manuals, primer texts and manuals, and listening tapes.
  2. The subjects from 10 Los Angeles schools were matched with a control group on intelligence, home background, and ethnic origin.
  3. The Horsch and Soeberg Survey Test of Primary Reading Development was used as a post-test.

Stemmler, Anne. An experimental approach to the teaching of oral language and reading. Report #BR-5-0249-1. Contract OEC-6-10-108, San Antonio, Texas, 1966.

This approach was based on a research study of language development and reading wholly concerned with the educationally disadvantaged, Spanish-speaking child in Texas.

C.1. Approach was developed from a study of a particular group having a high incidence of reading failure.
  2. In selecting any approach to the teaching of reading, including this approach which combines a self-concept and a science program, the choice should be based on the needs of the target population and the qualifications of the teachers.

Stemmler, Anne. The psychological and cognitive aspects of teaching English as a second language. Report #BR-5-0249-18. Contract OEC-6-10-108, San Antonio, Texas, 1966.

Descriptions were given of two operational frameworks for the instruction of educationally disadvantaged, Spanish-speaking children between the ages of 6 and 9 in the first and second grades of an English-speaking, middle class school environment.

C.1. 'The Science-Based Model' and 'The Self-Concept Model' were designed to promote the development of oral language and the acquisition of basic cognitive patterns.
  2. Science-based model.
    a. Selected concepts were analyzed and arranged according to concept development.
    b. Patterns of thinking and reasoning were used to structure scientific learning into sequentially organized learning experiences.
  3. Self-concept model. Designed to develop a positive and stable self concept or sense of personal identity.
  4. Asupporting program was developed from models..

Stern, Carolyn. The Pre-school Language Project. A Report of the First Year's Work. Los Angeles, U.C.L.A., 1966.

The effect of a formal, structured approach to language development on pre-school children is the subject of this project study.

C.1. From August 1965 to August 1966, 157 programs administered to 1663 children explored mental ability, auditory and visual discrimination, language use, vocabulary, and motivation.
  2. Tests were given to children attending day care centers, nursery schools and Head Start. The following observations were noted:
    a. Children from poor homes have inferior ability to discriminate spoken word sounds.
    b. When children are given interesting materials, their verbal output shows no differentiation.
    c. motivation is equal in advantaged and disadvantaged children.
  3. Experimental studies proved three dimensional toys do not produce superior learning, and repetition of grammatical sentences is preferred to story telling in developing verbal fluency.
  4. Project proposes a 30-week program to develop familiarity and facility with language in science, mathematics, social studies, literature, language usage, and logical processes on a pre-school level. The program would occupy only 15 minutes of the school day.

Stern, Carolyn. Pre-school language project. Paper. Working conference on Research and Activity in the Language Arts for the pre-primary Culturally Diverse Non-English Speaking Child, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1967.

The high school drop-out is identificable in the primary grades; therefore, it is necessary to lay the groundwork for vocational training much earlier than high school.

C.1. The basic premise of the five year pre-school language project is that it is important for disadvantaged children to develop standard middle class speech
2. Programmed materials are being prepared which can be presented by teacher aides in a fifteen minute session each day.
3. Special evaluative instruments have been developed for the purpose of assessing the value of this project.

Stern, Carolyn. Head Start Research and Evaluation Office, University of California at Los Angeles. Annual Report, Section II, Nov. 1967.

This is a research report on ways to improve academic achievement of disadvantaged children.

D. The following projects are described:
1. A study of sociolinguistic variables in school learning and problem solving when calsses are taught in dialect versus Standard English.
2. Subcultural determinants of cooperative and competitive behavior in pre-school children (e.g. reward condition, sex, ethnic background).
3. Measurement of change in social and personal attitudes of parents.
4. Development of evaluation instruments to study echoic responding as a function of the type of speech modelled.
5. An experimental study of variables in teaching mathematical concepts.

Stern, Carolyn and Evan Keislar. Comparative Effectiveness of Echoic and Modeling Procedures in Language Instruction with Culturally Disadvantaged Children. University of California at Los Angeles, Report #OEO-4139, 1968.

In an attempt to explore a systematic approach to language expansion and improved sentence structure, echoic and modeling procedures for language instruction were compared.

A.1. Four hypotheses were formulated:
   a. Children who use modeling procedures will produce better structured sentences than those who use echoic prompting.
   b. Echoic and modeling procedures will be more effective in verbal behavior than listening to stories and remaining silent.
   c. All three procedures will be more effective than those of the control group, who receive no special instruction.
   d. Girls will be superior to boys in parallel sentence production.
2. 48 Head Start children, divided into four groups were randomly assigned to one of the following:
   a. Echoic prompting.
   b. Parallel prompting (children listened to a sentence for the first picture and, using this as a model, produced the sentence for the second picture.
   c. Listening only.
   d. Control (pre-tests and post-tests with no special instruction).

3. Results supported only the first hypothesis significantly. Evidence shows, however, that children who listen to, echo or model well-formed sentences have facility to produce appropriate sentences as compared to children who are not so exposed.

Stewart, William A. Language and communication problems in Southern Appalachia. Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington D.C., 1967.

A linguistic field survey in the cultural geographical area of Appalachia shows that there are at least two major non-standard dialects in current use.

A.1. Mountain speech, although well structured and expressive in its own right, has come to be considered inferior, ungrammatical, and of low social stature.

2. The Negro dialect in this region has even less social status and is often mistakenly identified with mountain speech.

C. Programs for teaching Standard English should be based on an understanding of which ethnic and cultural groups so use this dialect, how each dialect contrasts with Standard English, and special linguistic techniques which have been developed for teaching Standard English to speakers of non-Standard dialects.

D. The author outlines a wide range of research, materials, and action programs which could be undertaken by the Appalachian Regional Educational Laboratory to improve language teaching.

Stewart, William A. Research in progress--social dialects of English. Report No. 3, Washington, D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 1967.

Included in this report are brief descriptions of 36 current, projected or recently completed social dialect studies in English.

D. The projects outlined deal with many aspects of sociolinguistics, including linguistic analysis of dialects, materials preparation for teaching Standard English to speakers of other dialects, pilot studies, dialect contact and change, and research on teaching methods for speakers of certain dialects.

Stewart, William A. Continuity and change in American Negro dialects. Florida Foreign Language Reporter, 1968.

The author compares grammatical patterns of Negro non-standard, white standard and non-standard, Gullah, English-based Creoles of the Carribean, and West African Pidgin English, and he calls for a reassessment of current dialect studies concerning the relationships among these varieties of English.

A.1. Structural traces of the Creole language may be heard today in the non-Standard English speech patterns of American Negroes (especially children).

B.1. It may be that 'the word form similarities between non-standard Negro dialects and non-standard white dialects are the result of a relatively superficial merging process' through minor pronunciation changes and vocabulary substitutions with the Creole grammatical patterns remaining resistant to this substitution process.

B.2. The teacher, unaware of the processes involved, may concentrate on the more obvious word form differences and miss the grammatical differences.

C. Realistic language programs for the disadvantaged Negro child must take into account 'ethnically correlated dialect differences'.

Stewart, William A. Sociolinguistic factors in the history of American Negro dialects. Florida Reports, Vol. 5, No. 2, 1967.

Remedial English programs still do not reflect structural observations on language variation among the disadvantaged.

A.1. In this study, the historical roots of primarily Negro speech patterns are found in the Creole and Pidgin English spoken by Negro slaves.

2. Even after the Civil War when the field hand Creole English began to take on more features of local white dialects, certain dialect features remained peculiar to Negro speech.

B. Understanding the historical linguistic processes that led to non-standard Negro dialects will help educators of the disadvantaged to communicate with applied linguists working on the same problems.

Stolz, Walter S. and others. Final Report on Head Start Evaluation and Research 166-67 to the Institute for Educational Development. Section V, The Role of Dialect in the School Socialization of Lower Class Children. Child Development Evaluation and Research Center, Texas, University, Austin, Texas, 1967.

The study was designed to examine the hypothesis that the adoption of the linguistic characteristics of a subculture other than a child's own is a valid indication of degree to which the child has become socialized into that subculture.

A.1. An experimental group of 54 first through third grade students from an isolated rural area was compared with a control population from the same grades of an upper-middle class suburban school.

2. Dialect samples provided indices of phonological, lexical, and syntactical variants which differentiated the linguistic behaviors of the 2 groups.

3. Three socialization measures were developed to assess the child's acceptance of middle class values.

4. The socialization measures were administered to the test groups and speech samples were elicited.

5. Analysis of data is still in progress, however, the computation of correlation coefficients for socialization and linguistic variables has, thus far, failed to support the original hypothesis.

Strong, Ruth. Teaching reading to the culturally disadvantaged in secondary schools. Journal of Reading, Vol. 10, May 1967.

Techniques to combat apathy and to use with informal reading material for diagnostic purposes are suggested.

C.1. Instruction growing out of an informal test.

C.2. Instruction and practice in word recognition.
  3. Fixing words in mind.
  4. Progress in word knowledge through the Fernald Finger Tracing Method.
  5. How to read a sentence.
  6. Instruction in paragraph comprehension.
  7. Accent on speech.
  8. Operant conditioning.
  9. Other methods, such as reading in a library, auto-instructional and programmed materials.
  10. Personalized instruction through the selection of suitable and attractive reading materials.

Stryker, William G. Experimenting with Transformations in the Elementary Grades. California English Journal, Vol. 4, No. 1, Winter 1968.

3 elementary demonstration classes at San Fernando Valley State College were taught to perform a variety of sentence-building exercises demanding work with kernel sentences and their transforms.

A.1. The primary class - a disadvantaged group - learned to manipulate questions, adjectives, and coordinating transformations.
  2. The third-fourth grade class (average) produced possessives, attributive adjectives, relative clauses, and questions.
  3. The fifth-sixth grade class (superior) experimented with passives, 'there' transformations, compound coordinates, and double-base transformations.
  4. At end of 6 week term, teachers agreed that at grade levels, children readily acquire the capacity to make transformations and that their writing profits by the exercise.

Tannenbaum, Abraham G. An early intervention program that failed. New York, Teachers College, Columbia, 1966.

The effect of special reading instruction on the reading ability of twenty-four matched pairs of culturally deprived first grade children was investigated.

A.1. The children were divided into an experimental and control group. The experimental group received additional instruction three times a week for 40 minutes from October 1964 to June 1965.
  2. Post-tests indicated no significant differences in reading ability between the two groups.
  3. Failure of program was possible due to inadequacy of using additional conventional reading readiness instruction instead of instructional innovations.
  4. The intervention program stressed:
    a. Visual discrimination.
    b. Auditory discrimination.
    c. Language development.
    d. Cognitive learnings.
    e. Developing body image sense.

Taz, Sol. Group identity and educating the disadvantaged. In Language Programs for the Disadvantaged. Champaign, Illinois., N.C.T.E, 1965.

Research based.

A.1. The systematic frustration of cultural minorities in this country has to do with lack of notions of cultural relativity and understanding.
  2. Cultural minorities will probably only accept values of the majority when these values are shown to have some immediate relevance to the minority.

C.1. Cultural understanding.
  2. Making majority values immediately relevant to the minority in a positive way.
  3. 'Traditional grammar instruction be de-emphasized in programs for the disadvantaged'.
  4. 'Literature appropriate to the interests and abilities of the students be studied at all secondary levels of English instruction'.

Tennessey, James. An exploratory study of non-English speaking homes and academic performance. Report #BR-6-1610-3. Grant OEG-2-7-061610-0207. Johns Hopkins University, 1967.

Language-related difficulties of Puerto Rican children in New York public schools were studied by a re-analysis of data previously collected in a U.S. Office of Education Survey.

A.1. Answers were sought to the following questions:
  a. What is the relationship between language spoken in the home and other aspects of ethnic background?
  b. What differences are present at several different grade levels in vocabulary test scores of Puerto Rican children from contrasting home-language backgrounds.
  2. A substantial amount of response errors on some interview questions made the data difficult to analyze.

B.1. Tentative conclusions -
  a. Language pattern is not very closely linked with other attributes of Puerto Rican ethnic background.
  b. When some background variables that are confounded with the language pattern are taken into account, there is little difference between the average test scores of the children from Spanish-English homes and the English only homes.
  c. Further research is needed to re-examine the conclusions of the U.S. Office of Education and similar data collected from disadvantaged elementary pupils.

Tiedt, S. Developing Language Abilities. In Sidney W. Tiedt (Ed.) Teaching the Disadvantaged Child, New York, Oxford University Press, 1968.

One of the basic problems of the disadvantaged child is that he is unable to express himself effectively.

A.1. Linguistic knowledge has provided teachers with the following attitudes and perceptions of language:
  a. Language constantly changes.
  b. The spoken language is the language. The development of oral

language should be given primary emphasis.

c. Language encompasses varied dialects. Dialects are not 'wrong' in a language sense, for they serve to communicate. Disadvantaged children may be taught standard English as a second dialect.

d. Language is a system with a definite pattern. The structural regularities of our language have strong implications for the disadvantaged.

e. Standards for usage may vary and the language of the child should not be attacked. The teacher can discuss the fact that there are different dialects, and that Standard English is more socially acceptable in formal situations.

C.1. In the elementary school, oral language fluency may be attained by:
   - a. Developing the child's desire to talk.
   - b. Providing topics for the child to talk about.
   - c. Giving him an opportunity to talk.

2. Students should be encouraged to talk about the things that interest them.

3. Some techniques for encouraging oral expression are:
   - a. Generating sentences - students are given a basic sentence and are asked to change it to the negative or into a question.
   - b. Expanding ideas - children are asked to expand a given sentence through modification, compounding, subordination or opposition.
   - c. Puppetry - this technique may be very effective in that the child can remain anonymous as he speaks.
   - d. Role Playing - role playing allows the child to express his ideas about a problem that concerns him.
   - e. Patterned response drills may be borrowed from foreign language instruction, e.g. Completion. The student is asked to finish a statement.

Teacher: Susan is tall, but ...
Joan: Susan is tall, but Mary is taller.

4. Development of adequate listening and speaking skills are fundamental to development in reading and writing skills.

Tincher, Ethel. Helping slow learners achieve success. English Journal, 54, 1965.

B.1. "Slow learners" constantly fail because
   - a. the learning material given them has little relevancy to them and consequently they drop out.

C.1. Relevant material for slow learners.

2. Positive reinforcement in terms of success with the relevant material.

Tri-University. Reason and Change in Elementary Education; Second National Conference, The U.S. Office of Education Tri-University Project in Elementary Education, New Orleans, 1968.

Included in this document are a copy of the conference program, an introduction by Paul A. Olson, conference papers accompanied by critiques and records of group discussions, and 'Final Responses from the Floor'.

D.1. Titles of papers and their authors are listed.

D.2. Papers presented on language include:
  a. 'The Role of Language in Learning in the Elementary School' by James Britton, critique by William Iverson.
  b. 'Social Groups and Their Languages' by Nancy Modiano.

Troike, Rudolph C. Social dialects and language learning: implications for TESOL. Washington D.C., Georgetown University, TESOL Institute of Language and Linguistics, 1968.

The author discusses some of the 'most immediately relevant' implications for TESOL which arise from research studies in dialectology.

A.1. A phenomenon, which until recently, has received little attention is that of 'receptive bi-dialectalism'.
  2. An individual presented with a stimulus in one dialect and asked to repeat it will respond by producing the form that is native to his own dialect.

C.1. Such evidence should give us pause in attempts to judge a child's linguistic competence solely on the basis of his production; rather we should begin by attempting to assess the child's receptive competence.
  2. If the child has an already well-developed receptive knowledge of a 'mainstream' dialect of the language, much of the instructional task can be seen as guiding him toward an automatic productive control of the mainstream dialect'.
  3. Implicit in this approach is the idea that only positive stimuli and motivations will be supplied to lead him to develop and practice this control.

Trout, L. Involvement through Slanted Language. In Peter G. Kontos and James J. Murphy (Eds.) Teaching Urban Youth: A Source Book for Urban Education. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.

The writer, an English teacher in the Princeton-Trenton Institute, describes how she involved ninth and tenth graders in language study by concentrating on Language and Propaganda, and the Protest movement in 1966.

C.1. A brief history of the English language was presented with records, copies of a language tree, blank maps of Europe, and quotes from Shakespeare.
  2. Students were asked to write advertisements for pictures of products. During a discussion of their 'selling' tactics, conclusions were drawn about the psychology of advertising. Students noted that some words were loaded and slanted to appeal to various groups.
  3. Students characterized teachers as persons who employed loaded words, and later described their concept of a model teacher.
  4. Mimeographed copies of propaganda techniques were distributed. Devices considered were 'name calling', 'glittering generalities', 'transfer', 'testimonial', 'card stacking', and the 'band wagon'.
  5. Students read and discussed Springboard publications on Nazism to explore what can happen when people are controlled by persuasion and propaganda.
  6. Students analyzed newspaper articles for examples of slanting and identified the technique used.

7. A peaceful revolution in thinking was evoked by teaching the protest movement in 1966. Students read parts of 'Nigger', 'Go Tell It on the Mountain','The Fire Next Time', 'To Kill a Mockingbird' and 'Why We Can't Wait' along with publications of the John Birch Society, Ku Klux Klan and various forms of hate literature.
8. Students debated the topic of violence versus non-violence and reacted to poems, plays, and films which described the black-white struggle.
9. The word 'nigger' was analyzed for the emotions it invoked when used by whites and when used by Negroes.
10. After discussing expression through color and form, students used finger paint to express their feelings bout civil rights.
11. From their notes on speeches by Martin Luther King and Malcolm X students refuted the main arguments and discussed ways of answering an argument.
12. Each faction in the movement displayed its propaganda intthe room using signs, slogans, pictures and projects.
13. Poems by Langston Highes, Richard Wright, James Weldon Johnson and Gwendolyn Brooks were prepared for choral reading.
14. The majority of the observing teachers at the institute felt that the protest movement was a strong and poignant way of revealing students' sentiments.

Twyford, Loran C. Education Communcations Media, in Ebel, Robert L. (Ed.) Encyclopedia of Educational Research, London, Macmillan, 1969.

Turner, Lorenzo D. Africanism in the Gullah Dialect, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

Research.

A.1. Certain Negro English dialects may be more subject to African influences than was previously thought.
2. This notion leads to a different, more insightful and more linguistically plausible analysis of those Negro English dialects.
3. This indicates the possibility that certain Negro English dialects are not something which can be labelled as basically English.

Vance, Barbara. The effect of pre-school group experience on various language and social skills in disadvantaged children. Final Report #BR-7-8070-2035. Palo Alto, Stanford University, 1967.

Fifty disadvantaged children, ages 33 to 56 months, participated in a 7 month pre-school educational program.

C.1. Tests used:
Language:
a. The Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities.
b. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (Form A).
c. The Vance Language Skills.
Social Competency:
The Cain-Levine Social Competency Scale.
2. Results were analyzed by T-Test and analysis of variance and were

matched against those of a comparable group who had stayed home.

3. Findings -
   a. The program did not seem to be effective in increasing the language skills scores and social competency scores of 3 and 4 year old disadvantaged children.
   b. The home and neighborhood environment appears to be as useful as a carefully planned pre-school situation in developing necessary language and social skills.

Varner, Carl L. English as a second language, Course of Study, Operation Head Start Project 0612. El Centro, California, Imperial County Schools, 1965.

A project Head Start course of study was developed as a guideline for teachers working with non-English speaking Mexican-Americans in a summer program in Calexico, California.

C.1. The objective of the project was to raise the cultural and educational level of disadvantaged pupils.
2. Emphasis was placed on English language basic vocabulary development through natural interest in common experiences.
3. Pre-school and kindergarten suggestions include field trips, family participation activities, classroom preparation ideas, and opening of school preparations.
4. No evaluation was reported.

Vito, Lawrence. The teaching of English to non-English speaking migrants. Naples, Florida. Collier Co. Board of Public Inst., 1967.

This provisional guide presents the usual English linguistic problems of Spanish-speaking learners--consonant sound problems, vowel sound problems, consonant cluster problems, language rhythm problems, and intonation problems.

C.1. Aids to Spanish usage and pronunciation are discussed, and teaching materials and teacher guidelines are recommended.
2. English-Spanish comparisons for names of children, familiar classroom expressions, and formal expressions used with adults are suggested.
3. Books I and II of Fries American English Series in identification of patterns are outlined.

Walker, Ursula Genung, Structural features of Negro English in Natchitoches Parish. Unpublished thesis. Northwestern State College, Natchitoches, Louisiana, 1968.

To test whether certain structures characteristic of West African languages are also present in the Negro English dialect of Natchitoches Parish, Louisiana, 355 autobiographical papers written by Negro high school students were analyzed.

A.1. 355 papers written by white high school students were used as controls.
2. Papers were analyzed following an outline of expected non-standard structures adopted from Turner's 'Africanisms in the Gullah Dialect'.
3. Results seemed to indicate that there is a definite African

sub-structure in this Negro dialect which is both masked and reinforced by a survival of certain archaic forms, the simplification of the Pidgin English first used by slaves, and normal simplifications found in 'folk speech'.

4. 95% of Negro students were affected by these factors as compared to 58% of the white students.
5. It was suggested that Negro dialects may have had a perceptible influence on the structure of white southern dialects.

C.1. Recommendations -
   a. Teachers should receive training in linguistics.
   b. Recognition and respect should be given to Negro and other dialects.
   c. Both linguistics and literature courses might be used to teach standard usage.
   d. A writing approach to English should be investigated.

Watson, William Gene. An in-service education program to facilitate integration in Oak Ridge schools through improvement of language skills and related curriculum from pre-kindergarten through junior high school. Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Oak Ridge School District, 1966.

This project was designed to improve the language arts and reading programs for Negro students at a racially segregated elementary school.

C.1. The program included pre-school education, implementation of a special reading program, development of instructional materials, and methods and approaches for dealing with disadvantaged youth in all curriculum areas.
2. A study center was organized at night and manned by volunteer teachers.
3. Extensive work was done by a coordinator in developing better home-school relationships.
4. An in-service teacher education workshop was conducted with consultants brought in to assist the teachers.
5. The report concluded that considerable gains were made in terms of I.Q. points and reading ability.

Weener, Paul David. The influence of dialect differences on the immediate recall of verbal messages. In Supplement to Studies in Language and Language Behavior. Progress Report V, 1967. Ann Arbor, Michigan University, Center for Research in Language Behavior, 1967.

The three hypotheses upon which this study was based stated that phonetic, syntactic, and semantic features of dialect differences would contribute to restrictions on the amount of information transmitted between members of different dialects.

A.1. Race, social class, and place of birth were the primary indices used to select a group of adults and children from two dialect areas in metropolitan Detroit.
2. Language samples from both groups of adults served as stimulus materials for an immediate recall task with the two groups of children.
3. Each stimulus presentation was defined by -
   a. The speaker.
   b. The source from which it was collected.

c. Its approximation to English-Word-Order.

A.4. The effect of phonetic differences was significant for the white middle class group but not for the Negro lower social class group, while the effects of source differences were not clearly observable in the data.

Weinstein, Gerald, and Mario, Fantani. 'Phoney' literature. English Journal, 54, 1965.

Experience based.

B.1. Most present school reading material is not relevant to the disadvantaged student and he consequently has no reason for caring about it.

C.1. Getting materials relevant to disadvantaged students.

2. Use of experiences of students in the classroom as subject matter for reading, discussion, and criticism.

Whipple, Gertrude, Comp. and Millard H. Black, Comp. Reading for Children Without--Our Disadvantaged Youth. Reading Aids Series, No. 3. Newark, Delaware, International Reading Association, 1966.

Successful reading programs for disadvantaged children are discussed by five authorities in the field.

D.1. Gertrude Whipple defines the kinds of pupils considered to be culturally disadvantaged, tells why they need a special program, and outlines the type of program needed.

2. Three sections deal with classroom activities and materials for these children -
   - a. Primary section--by Patricia Eastland, Detroit Public Schools.
   - b. Middle grades--by Leonore Wirthlin, Cincinnati Public Schools.
   - c. Secondary schools--by Gertrude Downing, Queens College.

3. The last section by Millard Black and Gertude Whipple, describes 10 reading programs, some that are schoolwide and others that are school-system-wide.

Whitehead, Frank. The Disappearing Dais: A Study of Principles and Practice of English Teaching. London, Chatto and Windus, 1966.

This book indicates that the main purpose of the English teacher is not to instruct, but to provide a relaxed, friendly atmosphere in which children can use and improve their language skills.

D.1. Discussion covers current teaching practices in reading, literature, poetry, drama, talking, and writing; improved practices which would take into account the natural interests of the students; problems involved in teaching English; and the adverse effects of external examination.

C.1. A recommendation that no attempt be made to teach grammar to children under 15 or 16 years is advanced.

Whiteman, Martin and others. Some effects of social class and race on children's language and intellectual abilities. N.Y., New York University, Institute for Developmental Studies, 1965.

A cross-sectional study of 292 first and fifth grade Negro and white children examined the relationship between environmental factors and performance test scores of verbal and cognitive ability.

A.1. Socio-economic status of each subject was determined and included in a deprivation index formed by obtaining a composite score across six background variables: housing dilapidation, parental educational aspirations, number of children under 18, dinner conversation, week-end cultural experiences, and attendance in kindergarten.

2. Dependent variables were a non-language test of general intellectual ability, the Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test, and the vocabulary sub-test of Wechsler's Intelligence Scale for Children.

3. Data was treated by a three way analysis of variance. Deprivation index acted as a factor independent of socio-economic status and race in contributing to variation in test performance.

4. Older children scored lower than younger ones, indicating that deficit is progressive. Environment however, can offsett deficits.

5. Negro status and lower socio-economic status are associated, so the Negro child is twice disadvantaged.

C.1. Pre-school intervention may be able to prevent accumulation of deficits.

Whitesides, Sheila. Administering the POSR to lower class children. Report #BR-5-0249-20 and M-4. Contract OEC-6-10-108, 1965.

A questionnaire was used for obtaining a rating of junior-teachers from their pupils in a grade school where the children were of Latin-American descent and from a low socio-economic status.

A.1. Questionnaire consisted of 40 questions requiring 'yes' or 'no' answers.

2. The first and second grade children had not been tested before in any way.
   a. They could not understand directions.
   b. Instructions to circle the correct answer confused them.
   c. Questions had to be read first in English and then in Spanish.

3. Some words and concepts appeared to be too advanced for the majority of students in grades 1-6.

C.1. Recommendations -
   a. Reading questions in both English and Spanish may help at all grade levels.
   b. Spanish-speaking persons can elicit more cooperation from the pupils, and perhaps, more honesty in the answers than an Anglo.

Wilkinson, Andrew and others. Spoken English. Occasional Publications Number Two. Educational Review, Vol. 17, No. 2, February 1969.

Modifications of current assumptions about the nature of spoken language and its functions in relation to personality development are suggested in this book.

Discussion covers:

D.1. An explanation of 'oracy' (the oral skills of speaking and listening).
2. Contributions of linguistics to the teaching of English in Britain.
3. Influences of early environment, education, social environment, mass media, and the British self-image on the development of speaking ability.
4. Methods of teaching spoken English; and the testing of oral expression and listening comprehension.

Willerman, Emily G. and others. A Digest of the Research Activities of Regional Evaluation and Research Centers for Project Head Start (September 1, 1966 to November 30, 1967.) New York, Institute for Educational Development. Report #OEO-1410. 1968.

A summary of the research activities of 13 Head Start regional evaluation centers is presented in three sections: research on children, research on parents and families, and research on classrooms, teachers and social organizations of Head Start centers.

D.1. Studies are grouped under appropriate sub-headings, such as 'language' or 'learning' and summarized.
2. Investigators' names, the university at which the work was done, and the purpose, method, and results, as well as implications for further research, are included.

Williamson, Juanita V. The speech of Negro high school students in Memphis, Tennessee. Final Report #BR-5-0592, Contract OEC-6-10-207, 1968.

The study deals with the phonology and grammar of the students' speech as compared with that of Standard English, particularly that of the Southern area.

A.1. Eighteen students from three large high schools were interviewed. Group discussions in the students' classrooms were also taped.
2. Results show phonological system of their speech is that which is found in the Southern area.
3. Most of the grammatical patterns which they use are found in Standard or sub-Standard Southern English. Two patterns which seem to be unique to the Negro students are a noun possessive that is identical with the base form of the noun and 'they' used as a possessive form.
4. A sentence pattern with a zero copula which some students use may occur in the Southern Mountain area.

Wilson, Marilyn. Standard Oral English, Seventh Grade. Instructional Guide A. Report #LACS-Pub.-ESEA-3-3. California, Los Angeles City Schools, Division of Secondary Education. July 1969.

D.1. A curriculum guide was prepared for the teaching of Standard oral English in Los Angeles Junior High Schools.
2. The guide focuses specifically on the teaching of Standard English to Negro students using a non-standard dialect.
3. All lessons were designed to use with accompanying tapes and film-strips.

Wilson, Robert and others. Guides for teaching English as a second language to elementary school pupils. Report #H-200, U.C.L.A., 1968.

The materials prepared by this project contain a series of daily lessons based on audio-lingual principles of learning.

C.1. Eight or ten children are taken from their regular classroom each day for approximately a half-hour of special instructions.
2. Each lesson includes review and evaluation activities as well as special directions to the teacher.
3. This report includes a description of two studies comparing the growth in language efficiency of children using the project materials with matched groups receiving no special instructions.
4. Results indicate that the children receiving instruction through the use of the project materials compare favorably in their ability to use English with children of their own age group who speak English as their own native language.
5. Also included in the report is a description of activities and rationale, conclusions and recommendations.

Wisconsin University. The Nature of Language Learning. University of Wisconsin Magazine, Vol. 2, No. 2, April 1968.

Four behavioral scientists in a colloquium at the University of Wisconsin discussed various aspects of language.

Proposals offered:

C.1. Language teaching is more effective if taught in a natural setting.
2. Environmental conditions affect language learning.
3. Children learn their own language through idiomatic expressions.
4. The ability to learn a second language is innate.
5. Attitude, prestige of language and culture, motivation, and psychological barriers can hinder or aid language learning.

Witcoff, Harold and others. The teaching of reading, a report of a study conducted by the Curriculum Committee of the Minneapolis Citizens Committee on Public Education 1966. Minneapolis, Minneapolis Citizens Committee on Public Education, 1966.

The methods described in this report are the phonic-first method, the use of basal readers, the linguistic approach, the initial teaching alphabet, the language-experience approach, the programmed reading approach, and individualized reading. Other topics covered include reading readiness, parent readiness, and teaching the culturally disadvantaged, the mentally retarded, the brain injured, and the gifted child.

Young, Rober W. English as a second language for Navajos, an overview of certain cultural and linguistic factors. Washington D.C., Appalachian Regional Commission, 1968.

Cross-cultural training for teachers of English to Navajo children is necessary because many concepts are not shared by both cultures.

A.1. The phonological, grammatical and structural features of the two languages constitute areas of wide divergence.

A.2. In the Navajo language, vowel length and nasal quality of vowels distinguish meaning, consonant clusters do not appear at the end of syllables, and many English nouns when translated are verbal forms in Navajo.

C.1. By distinguishing areas of sharp divergence, a framework is presented for the development of materials, instructional techniques, and teacher training to meet the needs of the Navajo student of English.

Youtz, Adella C. and Putnam, Lillian R. Multi-Variable Comparison of Structural Reading Program and an Enriched Basal Reading Program with Disadvantaged Urban Children. Final Report #BR-7-8079. Contract OEG-1-7-078079-3085, 1968.

This exploratory multi-variable comparison of an augmented structural (Stern and Gould) and an enriched basal (Winston) program was conducted with two matched classes of low to average ability children in grades 1 and 2.

C.1. At end of grade 1 basal grade rated significantly superior on the Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension Test and the California Test of mental maturity.

2. Structural class rated significantly superior on the Structural Reading Achievement Test and in number of words written on the writing sample.

3. Analysis of covariance, with mental ability controlled, showed the structural class to be equal or superior on most measures of the study.

4. Growth of the structural class in language components and their favorable academic work habits suggested that structural method provided a stronger foundation in language skills for these children.

Zilliax, John. Teaching English to disadvantaged high school students. Minnesota English Journal, Vol. 4, No. 1, January 1968.

Descriptions are given of two summer programs intended to help talented students from disadvantaged environments bridge the gap between their backgrounds and private boarding schools in which they will enroll.

C.1. Carleton College English teachers have devised a program to encourage students' uninhibited expression as well as the acquisition of basic skills of communication.

2. The writing program centers on a sequence of 12 writing assignments, and the reading program is built around a core of five short allegorical novels.

3. Another summer program at Milton Academy, Massachusetts, is briefly described.

SECTION III

This section contains the material derived from the bibliographic items regarded as suitable for abstraction. The material has been presented under twelve broad category headings. They are:

1. Sub-cultural patterns
2. Dialects and usage
3. Non-Standard Negro English
4. Indian
5. Spanish American
6. Intellectual development and performance
7. Bi-lingualism
8. Language and Language Arts
9. Reading
10. Linguistic methods
11. Project Head Start
12. Pre-school Language Development Projects.

The categories are those into which the various items appeared to fit when the initial attempt was made to order the 'universe of study'. It is apparent that the categories are concrete or existential --they represent 'naturally appearing' divisions. To this extent they do not necessarily conform to any specific theoretical position either linguistic or educational. In fact they represent somewhat of an admixture of both. There is however, a kind of logical progression in the way the items are ordered. The first category--sub-cultural patterns--represents the starting point of the whole operation. Because language usage differs according to the cultural context in which users live, any attempt at the examination of language behavior and education should advisedly commence here. However, the difference between a sub-culture language and the dominant culture language may be one of two kinds. It is either a sub-language--a dialect which is in fact a variant on the dominant language--or else it is a different language altogether. This accounts for the ordering of items 2, 3, 4 and 5, viz.; Dialects and usage, Non-Standard Negro English, Indian, and Spanish American. Once background language factors are recognized, it becomes a matter of taking them into account as they influence the educational process. However, the educational process is also influenced by the ways in which a child's intellect develops. Thus Bi-lingualism or rather bi-cultural language and Child Development have to be viewed in close association. In this way items 6 and 7 prepare the ground for a more direct attack on some educational issues namely Language Arts and Reading which occupy places number 8 and 9. However, at this stage in the sequence it is necessary to give particular consideration to the Linguistic point of view. It therefore is placed at number 10. Finally bringing up the rear of the field are two items dealing with projects. They are so placed partly because pre-school education was not a matter of direct concern to us and partly because few of the projects have realized the hopes originally held for them. However, we felt it would be remiss to neglect them.

It will be obvious that the material in the abstracts is not always presented in the same manner under each category heading. Variations in format are due principally to the idiosyncratic character to the category. For example, it has been found useful, under the 'projects' heading to note: (1) basic premises, (2) description of the study, (3) pupil performance, (4) tests used, and (5) recommendations. These headings would of course be inappropriate for some of the other categories. However, there is a considerable amount of commonality from one category to the next. This results from the fact that each category lists: (1) items of information relevant to the heading, and (2) recommendations made.

Finally, it should be noted first that the statements reported have not been evaluated or judged--they are listed because they were in the original item--and second, that because of the very cryptic nature of the abstraction, readers would be well advised to resort to the original for fuller understanding.

Subcultural Patterns

Information

1. Negative effect of isolation and deprivation (Deutsch, 1967)
2. Auditory mode of learning less efficient than visual mode (Deutsch, 1967)
3. Pronunciation and vocabularies different from average students (Lloyd, 1963)
4. Deficiency of non-Standard English (Cazden, 1966)
5. Achievement affected by child's self-confidence (Cazden, 1966)
6. Social class affects language development (Cazden, 1966)

Recommendations

1. Consider spoken English in terms of cultural level (Kenyan, 1948)
2. Emphasize elements common to all speech (Lloyd, 1963)
3. Accept child's spoken language (Lloyd, 1963)
4. Evaluate language development toward norms of particular speech community (Cazden, 1966)
5. Proper design of educational programs (Anderson & Johnson, 1968)

Dialects and Usage

Information

1. From the view of social function, bidialectism and bilingualism may be same (Gumperz, 1962)
2. There are no 'sloppy' dialects (Shuy, 1968) (Hall, 1956) (Protheroe, 1968)
3. Non-standard dialects and languages are often mistakenly linked with incorrectness, inferiority, and immorality (Loban, 1968) (Cohen, 1959)
4. Dialect or language may be indicative of social class and social acceptance (Walker, 1968) (Stewart 1967) (Higgins, 1960) (Harms, 1963) (Ryckman, 1967) (Bernstein, 1960) (Currie, 1952) (Bernstein, 1958) (Hammond, 1967)
5. Dialects or languages may vary in phonology, syntax, and semantics (Shuy, 1968) (Ruddell & Graves, 1966)
6. Non-standard dialects and languages are as complex and legitimate in their contexts as standard ones are in their contexts (Shuy, 1968) (Lamberts, 1962) (Kurath, 1961) (Cohen, 1959) (Hammond, 1967) (Protheroe, 1967) (Troike, 1968)
7. Dialects vary regionally and socially (Hill, 1951) (Kurath, 1961) (Rogers, 1965)

8. The higher the social status of a dialect, the more comprehension and credibility attributes to the speaker (Harms, 1963) (Gomberg, 1966)
9. Affected by environment (Wisconsin Colloquium, 1968) (Anastasi & Angelo, 1952) (Entwisle, 1967)
10. A given dialect or language probably structures or is indicative of a given manner of thought (Gessman, 1960) (Ruark, 1967) (Barritt, 1965)
11. Dialect or language conflict can cause learning problems (Lavatelli, 1967) (Hammond, 1967)
12. Home language may inhibit learning of school language (Lamberts, 1962) (Deutsch, 1963)

Approaches and Recommendations

1. Teaching dialects in school may instill linguistic objectivity or at least tolerance (Gott, 1964)
2. Teaching a speaker of one dialect another dialect requires concise descriptions of both dialects and cultures (Stewart, 1967) (Shuy, 1968) (Kurath, 1961) (Edwards, 1967)
3. The lower-class dialects should be supplemented rather than replaced (New language experience) (Shuy, 1968) (Currie, 1952)
4. Teacher acceptance and utilization of the student and his spoken language and experience (Stewart, 1967) (Loban, 1968) (Kasdon, 1967) (Hall, 1956) (Cohen, 1959) (Protheroe, 1967) (Troike, 1968) (Rogers, 1965)
5. The teaching of dialect and language propriety (Shuy, 1968) (Hill, 1951) (Higgins, 1960)
6. Exposure to and practice in the dialect being taught as well as the first dialect (Loban, 1968) (Edwards, 1967)
7. Focus on dialect differences rather than 'correctness' or 'incorrectness' (Loban, 1968)
8. Pre-school training (Lloyd, 1968)
9. Introduction of new cultural experiences to the culturally different and theccultúrally deprived (Cutis, 1963)
10. Testing to find particular needs (Kurath, 1961) (Lado, 1957)
11. Teaching of spoken language rather than antiquated formal language (Hartung, 1956) (Gove, 1963)
12. Attitude, prestige, culture, etc. can help or hinder language learning (Wisconsin Colloquium, 1968)
13. Positive reinforcement (Edwards, 1967)

Non-Standard Negro English

Information: Characteristics: Socio-geographic

1. Negro lower class (adults and children) (Davis, 1968) (Osser, 1962) (Whiteman and others, 1965)
2. Negroes of southern origin (Davis, 1968) (Lane, Harlan and others, 1967) (Williamson, 1968) (Bryden, 1968) (Massad, 1968) (Walker, 1968)
3. Differs from non-Negro lower class speech (Kelley, 1962)
4. Probable African linguistic and cultural influences (Hall, 1950) (Walker, 1968)
5. Conscious Non-Standard Negro English-unique lexicon construction (Kelley, 1962)
6. Lack of experiences necessary for school success (Ruddell & Graves, 1968) (Ecroyd, 1968)

Information: Characteristics: Language

1. Unique underlying grammar varying from Standard English (Labov & Cohen, 1967) (Labov, 1966) (Davis, 1968) (Lane, Harlan and others, 1967) (Loflin & Sobin, 1968b) (Loflin, 1966) (Labov, 1967) (Labov & Cohen, 1967) (Loflin, 1967) (Stewart, 1968) (Dillard, 1967) (Williamson, 1968) (Carroll & Feigenbaum, 1967) (Osser, 1962) (Baratz, 1968) (Bryden, 1968) (Massad, 1968) (Ecroyd, 1968) (Baratz, 1968) (Walker, 1968) (Shuy, 1968)
2. Specific differences noted are:
   a. Form of auxiliary tense structures (Labov & Cohen, 1967) (Golden, 1960) (Loflin & Sobin, 1968a) (Ruddell & Graves, 1968) (Loban, 1968)
   b. Number of auxiliary tense structures (Loflin & Sobin, 1968) (Loflin & Sobin, 1968a) (Loflin & Sobin, 1968b) (Bailey, 1965) (Stewart, 1968)
   c. Subject verb agreement (Golden, 1960)
   d. Negation (Golden, 1960) (Bailey, 1965)
   e. Auxiliary structure--time adverb co-occurrences (Loflin & Sobin, 1968) (Loflin, 1966) (Loflin, 1967)
   f. Phonology (Labov & Cohen, 1967) (Williamson, 1968) (Carroll & Feigenbaum, 1967)
   g. Meaning of at least the tense structures (Loflin & Sobin, 1968a) (Loflin & Sobin, 1968b) (Loflin, 1966) (Carroll & Feigenbaum, 1967)
   h. Some unique lexicon (Kelley, 1962)
   i. Some unique possessive markers (Bailey, 1965) (Williamson, 1968) (Ruddell & Graves, 1968)
   j. Some phonological aspects may be same as white southern Standards and non-Standard English (Davis, 1968) (Williamson, 1968)

Problems

1. Non-standard speaker's ignorance of Standard English (Ecroyd, 1968) (Dillard, 1967) (Labov, 1966)
2. Teachers ignorance of non-Standard English (Ecroyd, 1968) (Baratz, 1968) (Dillard, 1967) (Labov, 1966)
3. Equating Standard English with morality (Davis, 1968)
4. Blocking notions of positive African language and cultural influence
5. No motivation for learning Standard English (Labov, 1967)
6. Often only superficial problems are dealt with (Stewart, 1968) (Stewart, 1968)

Solutions and Recommendations

1. Standard English as a foreign language (Davis, 1968)
2. First teaching oral understanding, then (Davis, 1968)
3. Oral practice, then (Davis, 1968) (Ecroyd, 1968) (Cohen, 1966)
4. Reading and writing (Davis, 1968) (Ecroyd, 1968) (Cohen, 1966)
5. A precise description of Non-Standard Negro English (Dillard, 1967) (Stewart, 1968) (Stewart, 1969) (Shuy, 1968) (Loflin & Sobin, 1968a)
6. A precise description of Standard English (Golden, 1960) (Labov, 1966)
7. Objective study of Non-Standard Negro English (Labov, 1966) (Golden, 1960) (Hall, 1950) (Loflin & Sobin, 1968) (Labov & Cohen, 1967)
8. Objective study of native Non-Standard Negro English speakers language acquisition patterns (Dillard, 1967) (Walker, 1968)
9. Provide motivation for learning Standard English in terms of Non-Standard Negro English speakers (Labov, 1967)
10. History of Non-Standard Negro English to help in tis analysis and cultural understanding (Hall, 1950) (Dillard, 1967) (Stewart,)
11. Better home-school relations (Watson, 1966)
12. Special programs for Non-Standard Negro English speakers (Watson, 1966)
13. Standard English taught as an addition to rather than a replacement of Non-Standard Negro English (Carroll & Feigenbaum, 1967) (Ruddell & Graves, 1968) (Shuy, 1968)
14. Rich and varied experiences (Ruddell & Graves, 1968) (Loban, 1968)
15. Learning dialect or language propriety in given situations (Baratz, 1968)
16. Making the teacher a linguist (Walker, 1968)
17. Teaching students linguistics (Walker, 1968)

Indians

Problems

1. High drop-out rates (Smith, 1968)
2. Low level of academic achievement (Smith, 1968)
3. Excessively timid students (Sivadesh, 1968)
4. Standardized tests which do not measure capabilities accurately (Potts and Sizemore, 1964)
5. Cultural and linguistic factors constitute areas of wide divergence (Young, 1968)

Recommendations

1. A knowledge of Indian environment, values and customs (Greenberg & Greenberg, 1964) (Sivadesh, 1968)
2. National advisory council on Indian education (Ohannessian, 1967)
3. Re-examination of patterns of schooling (Ohannessian, 1967)
4. Emphasis upon developing ability to communicate in English (Hoffman, 1968) (Potts, & Sizemore, 1964)
5. Testing with a definite purpose and great care (Potts & Sizemore, 1964)
6. Courses in linguistics for teachers (Smith, 1968)
7. Respect for cultural differences (Hoffman, 1968) (Smith, 1968)
8. Increase Johnson-O'Malley funds for Indian students (Smith, 1968)
9. Program of teacher preparation with a minimum of 126 semester hours (Osborn, 1968)
10. Education programs for Indian adults (Greenberg & Greenberg, 1964)

Spanish Americans

Information: Values

1. La Raza-concept of splendid and glorious destiny (Dworkin, 1968)
2. Machismo-cult of masculinity (Dworkin, 1968)
3. Family centered family (Dworkin, 1968)
4. School viewed as Anglo-Saxon authority (Dworkin, 1968)
5. Spanish important link with native country (Dworkin, 1968)
6. Desire to maintain cultural heritage (Angel, 1968)

Information: Characteristics of Anglo-Americans

1. Discourage diverse cultures (Howe, 1968)
2. Child centered family (Harter, 1960)
3. Counselors encourage manual training (Dworkin, 1968)
4. Lack of knowledge of historical background of Spanish American (Knowlton, 1966)

5. Deprivation of minority groups from political office, sociological advancement and economic security (Knowlton, 1966)
6. Disregard for learner's psychological set and cultural heritage (Scarth & Regan, 1968)
7. Insistence on all English classes (Scarth & Regan, 1968)

Problems

1. Limited language learning (Hobscn, 1969)
2. Inability to express themselves (Hobson, 1969)
3. Consonant sounds, (Vito, 1967)
4. Vowel sounds (Vito, 1967)
5. Consonant clusters (Vito,(1967)
6. Language rhythm (Vito, 1967)
7. Intonation (Vito, 1967)
8. High incidence of reading failure (Stemmler, 1966)
9. High drop out rates (Scarth & Regan, 1968)
10. Illiteracy (Scarth & Regan, 1968)
11. Poor achievement on diagnostic tests and in classwork (Dworkin, 1968) (Scarth & Regan, 1968)

Recommendations

1. Recruit male Mexican American teachers (Dworkin, 1968)
2. Require Spanish for teacher certification (Dworkin, 1968) (Knowlton, 1966) (Howe, 1968)
3. English as a second language (Angel, 1968) (Knowlton, 1966) (Harter, 1960) (Rosen & Ortego 1969)
4. Emphasis on cognitive development (Angel, 1968)
5. Proper affective development (Angel, 1969)
6. Use of child's native language Libaw, 1968) (Scarth & Regan, 1968) (Whitesides, 1965) (Knowlton, 1965)
7. Trips and sensory experiences to get children to talk (Hobson, 1969)
8. English-Spanish comparisons for familiar classroom experiences (Vito, 1967)
9. Subject matter taught in English and Spanish at separate periods (Howe, 1968) (Knowlton, 1966) (Rosen & Ortego, 1969) (Ott, 1968)
10. Different teaching and leadership style (Hobson, 1969) (Rosen & Ortego, 1969)
11. Parental involvement in school activities (Dworkin, 1968)
12. Better inter-group relations (Angel, 1968)
13. Occupational education (Angel, 1968)

14. Proper direction in use of federal aid (Howe, 1968)
15. Evaluate historical role in future of Southwest (Knowlton, 1966) (Pascual, 1967) (Smith, 1968)
16. Awareness of tragic experiences of Spanish American people (Knowlton, 1966)
17. Professionally trained ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) specialists (Scarth & Regan, 1968)
18. Fluency in English (Manuel, 1965) (Ott, 1967) (Pena, 1967) (Smith, 1968)
19. Readiness for the common curriculum (Rosen & Ortego, 1969)
20. Broaden economic opportunities (Pascual, 1967)

Intellectual Development and Performance

Information: Correlates

1. Mother's verbal I.Q. (Olim, 1965)
2. Social class (John, 1967) (Olim, 1965)
3. Mother's use of imperative language (Olim et al, 1967)
4. Lack of educational materials, travel experiences (Green, 1966)
5. Sub-standard schools (Green, 1966)
6. Impoverished language (Ausubel, 1965)
7. Impaired self-confidence (Ausubel, 1965)
8. Poor perceptual discrimination (Ausubel, 1965)
9. Inability to use adults as sources of information (Ausubel, 1965)
10. Inferior skills in concept integration (John, 1967)
11. Status oriented mother (Olim et al, 1967)
12. Object context orientation (Greenfield, 1968) (Ausubel, 1965)
13. Seldom spoken to or read to (Ausubel, 1965) (John, 1967)

Information: Some Causes of Test Performance

1. Low socio-economic level (Anastasi & Cordova, 1953)
2. Lack of test sophistication (Anastasi & Cordova, 1953)
3. Poor emotional adjustment to school (Anastasi & Cordova, 1953)
4. Anxiety associated with white examiners (Phillips, 1966)
5. Deficiency in Spanish and English (Anastasi & Cordova, 1953)
6. Unfamiliarity with formal language (Ausubel, 1965)

Recommendations

1. School environment which stimulates intellectual growth (Green, 1966)
2. Teacher training programs (Green, 1966)
3. Focus on readiness (Ausubel, 1965)
4. Dynamic administrators who demand quality education (Green, 1966)
5. Programmed instruction (Ausubel, 1965)
6. Expansion of linguistic environment in pre-school years (Olim, 1965)
7. New teaching techniques (John, 1967)

Bilingualism

Problems

1. Must learn two alternative cognitive sets (Hurgen, 1956)
2. Difficulties in keeping two languages separate (Haugen, 1955)
3. Insecure in school (Koenig, 1953)
4. May stutter or withdraw (Koenig, 1953)
5. Handicapped until dominant language is learned (Knowlton, 1965)
6. Regard native language and culture as inferior (Knowlton, 1965)
7. Educational procedures for monolinguals prove deficient (Cline, 1962)
8. Using appropriate language in appropriate social setting (Hurgen, 1956)
9. Verbal intelligence tests inadequate for testing (Galvan, 1967)

Potential Results of Early Bilingualism

1. May facilitate superior performance on intelligence tests (Diebold, 1966)
2. Psychopathology can be traced to antagonistic acculturative pressures (Diebold, 1966)
3. Gives student a base for success in the world of work, while preserving and enriching cultural resources (Rodriguez, 1968)

Recommendations

1. Teach students in native language while they master English (Knowlton, 1965)
2. Non-verbal creative activities (Koenig, 1953) (Howe, 1967)
3. Creative synthesis of southwest cultures (Koenig, 1953)
4. Friendly classroom climate (Sizemore, 1962)
5. Comparisons between native language and English (Sizemore, 1962)
6. Verbal interaction in both languages (Finocchiaro, 1966)
7. Field experiences for student teachers in second language capacities (Past, 1966)

8. Teacher training in intercultural communication and linguistics (Rodriguez, 1968)
9. Cultural enrichment projects (Ervin, 1961) (Maynes, 1967)
10. Reduced class sizes (Howe, 1967)
11. Non-verbal tests of intelligence (Galvan, 1967)

Language and Language Arts

Usage

1. Determined by social situation (Dehnke, 1968) (Tiedt, 1968)
2. Dialects are not 'wrong' (Martin, 1968) (Tiedt, 1968) (Smiley, 1965)
3. Standards vary (Martin, 1968) (Tiedt, 1968)
4. Dialects serve to communicate (Tiedt, 1968)

Problems

1. Teachers do not understand non-standard speakers (Brooks, 1964) (Lin, 1965)
2. Culturally deprived grouped with remedial students (Brooks, 1964)
3. Culturally deprived are frustrated by school system (Smiley, 1965) (Holbrook, 1964)
4. Texts and methods are not relevant (Corbin, 1965)
5. Little motivation to learn Standard English (Corbin, 1965)
6. Teachers think of socially unacceptable dialects as 'bad' (Lin, 1965)
7. Child is unable to express himself (Tiedt, 1968)
8. Limited usage constrains intellectual development and social mobility (Gussow & Bailey, 1965)
9. Inadequate vocabulary (Cheyney, 1967)

Recommendations

1. Develop desire to talk (Lin, 1965) (Tiedt, 1968)
2. Provide topics for child to talk about (Dailey & Meymann, 1965) (Martin, 1968) (Tiedt, 1968)
3. Give child opportunity to talk. (Dailey & Mayman, 1965) (Golden & Martellock, lo67) (Giedt, 1968) (Whitehead, 1966) (Zilliax, 1968)
4. Better understanding of non-standard speech (Shuy, 1968)
5. Teach English as a second language (Brooks, 1964) (DeMatos, 1966) (Curriculum Bulletin, 1965-66) (Tiedt, 1968)
6. Make teachers more linguistically competent (NCTE, 1965)
7. Systematic approach to language learning (Smiley, 1965)
8. Appropriate reading materials (NCTE, 1965) (Smiley, 1965) (Trout, 1967) (Fagan, 1967)

9. De-ethnocentricization of teacher attitudes, texts, materials and methods (NCTE, 1965)
10. More objective notion of culture and language usage (DeMatos, 1966)
11. Use of creative activities (Trout, 1967) (Holbrook, 1964) (NCTE, 1965-66)
12. Respect for child's language and culture (DeMatos, 1966)
13. More realistic teacher training (DeMatos, 1966)
14. Encourage students to question nature of language differences (Dehnke, 1968)
15. Investigation of attitudes toward dialect and bilingualism (Gussow & Bailey, 1965)
16. Studies of motives and procedures for change (Gussow & Bailey, 1965)
17. Studies of relationship of language to cognitive processes (Gussow & Bailey, 1965)
18. Greater stress on oral language (NCTE, 1965)
19. Greater financial support to school programs (NCTE, 1965)
20. Pre-service and in-service teacher education (NCTE, 1965)
21. Cooperation among persons, organizations and institutions working with the disadvantaged (NCTE, 1965)
22. A sociolinguistic approach to language development (John, 1967)
23. Programmed instruction (Gotkin, 1967) (Regan, 1967)
24. Involve parents (NCTE, 1965)
25. Provide good classroom and school libraries (NCTE, 1965)
26. Focus on what is communicated, not how (NCTE, 1965) (Hayakawa, 1966)
27. Suppress obsession with grammar (Whitehead, 1966) (Hayakawa, 1966)
28. Nurture sensitivity to 'metamessages', subtleties of tone, figurative language, intonation and emphasis (Trout, 1967) (Hayakawa, 1966)
29. Games, plays which emphasize correct speech patterns (Golden & Martellock, 1967) (Gotkin, 1968)
30. Pattern drills which hit points of conflict (Osborn) (Wilson and others, 1968) (NCTE, 1965-66) (Lin, 1965)

Reading

Problems

1. Non-relevant materials (Tincher, 1965) (Spiegler, 1965) (Weinstein, 1965) (Duggins, 1965)
2. A Frustrating system (Tincher, 1965) (Arnold, 1962)
3. Consequent lack of motivation (Tincher, 1965)

4. Lack of informed teachers and leaders (Gray, 1956) (Lloyd, 1958) (Cohen, 1966)
5. Home environment not conducive to or fostering reading habits (McCr ssan, 1966) (Lloyd, 1958)
6. Rigid school-class structuring (Lloyd, 1958)
7. Lack of good materials and procedures (Lloyd, 1958)
8. School class size
9. Different language or dialect between teacher and student (Arnold, 1962)
10. Teachers linking good spoken, read, and written Standard English with moral good (too ethnocentric) (Davis, 1968) (Duggins, 1965)

Approaches and recommendations

1. Use relevant material (Tincher, 1965) (Craig, 1967) (Cohen, 1966) (Spiegler, 1965) (Weinstein, 1965) (Duggins, 1965)
2. Use positive reinforcemnt (Tincher, 1965)
3. Recognize the student as an individual needing individual attention (teacher attitude) (Ross, 1965) (Robb, 1967) (Strong, 1967) (Cohen, 1966) (Webster, 1968)
4. Reform teacher attitude (Ross, 1965) (Duggins, 1965)
5. Verbal language study preceeding reading training (Davis, 1968) (Craig, 1967) (Sizemore, 1963)
6. Programs need to be localized (Gray, 1956)
7. Some cultural training and understanding may be required (Sizemore, 1963)
8. Available library (Strong, 1967)
9. Language-experience approach (Morrison & Harris, 1968) (Kohl, 1967)
10. Basal reader approach (Canne, 1966) (Youtz & Putnam, 1968) (Harris & Serwer, 1966)
11. Pre-service and in-service training (Lloyd, 1968)
12. Pre-school training (Lloyd, 1968) (Gomberg, 1966)
13. School-class size reduction (Lloyd, 1968)
14. Students writing about own experiences (Kohl, 1967) (Weinstein, 1965)
15. Grammatical spelling rules shouldn't be forced immediately (Kohl, 1967)
16. Initial teaching alphabet with 2 years of Peabody Language Development Kit (Dunn et al, 1969
17. Supplemental Conventional Reading Program (w. Phonics) (shown superior to language (dunn et al, 1967)
18. Foreign language approach to teaching Standard English (spoken before written) (Cutis, 1963) (Davis, 1968)

19. Acceptances--the student as a valid language speaker (Cutis, 1963)
20. Linguistic instruction as early as beginning reading (Cohen, 1966)
21. Teacher reading to class (Cohen, 1966)
22. Summer reading retention programs (Arnold, 1968)
23. Parent participation (Amsden, 1967)
24. Private study areas (Duggins, 1965)
25. Teaching spoken language before written language (Cohen, 1966)

Linguistic Methods

Recommendations

1. Acceptance and awareness by teacher and student of the individual and his 'style' for teaching and learning (Reismann, 1968)
2. Description of learners language and culture and description of language and culture to be taught are necessary in best teaching a language (Lado, 1957) (Shuy, 1968)
3. Integrating schools (Barritt, 1967)
4. Formal linguistic teaching of Standard English (Marckwardt, 1963)
5. Teaching proper code in proper context (Golden, 1968) (Rogers, 1965) (Cutis, 1963)
6. Analysis of the processes by which children learn language (Marckwardt, 1963)
7. Tolerance of non-standard dialects and languages (Rogers, 1965)
8. Teacher's knowledge and manipulation of students' language as a tool for learning and teaching (Rogers, 1965) (Hollman, 1968)
9. Recognition of social and geographic language variants (Rogers, 1965) (Hill, 1951) (Kurath, 1963)
10. Early stimulation programs (Lloyd, 1968) (Gomberg, 1966)
11. Aural-oral approach (Loban, 1968) (Arnold, 1968) (Duggins, 1965)

Project Head Start

Information: Purpose of projects

1. Raise cultural and educational levels (Stern, 1967) (Varner, 1965)
2. Methodological approaches for expressive language samples (Raph, 1965)
3. Measure language development (Osser, 1968)
4. Determine effect of intervention programs (Daniel & Giles, 1966)
5. Test language ability and school readiness (Hubbard & Zarate, 1967) (Cowling, 1967)
6. Insights into language learning and speech therapy (Brigham, 1963)

7. Measure reading achievement (Ramsey & Boercker)
8. Differentiate dialect differences from articulation defects (Berman & Monsces, 1968)

Information: Methods

1. Encourage children to talk (Butler, 1967) (Raph, 1965)
2. Emphasize vocabulary development (Varner, 1965)
3. Tape spontaneous expressions (Raph, 1965)
4. Ask children to describe things (Byrne, 1967) (Osser, 1968)
5. Ask children to imitate language models (Stern & Keislar, 1968) (Byrne, 1967)
6. Reinforcement of verbal imitation (Brigham, 1963)
7. Assessment of overall communicative ability (Berman & Monsces, 1968)

Information: Results

1. Greater oral language development (Alexanian, 1967) (Byrne, 1967) (Daniel & Giles, 1966)
2. More effective in language development of low intelligence pupils (Daniel & Giles, 1966)
3. Children better able to be understood by teacher (Cowling, 1967)
4. Children more ready for school (Cowling, 1967) (Cawley, 1966)
5. More self-confidence in school (Cowling, 1967)

Recommendations

1. Field trips, family participation activities, classroom preparation ideas (Butler, 1967) (Varner, 1965)
2. Encourage children to talk about toys, events, books or pictures (Butler, 1967)
3. Read and talk to children (Butler, 1967)
4. Freedom to talk (Butler, 1967)
5. Some radical approach to teaching reading (Ramsey & Boercker)

Pre-school Language Development Projects

Information: (Premises)

1. Important to develop standard middle class speech (Stern, 1966)
2. Should learn to decode meaning and construct responses (Lavatelli, (1968)

Information: Descriptions

1. Cognitive and social functioning (Beller, 1967)
2. A highly structured and a traditional program (Karnes and others, 1966)

3. Language and social skills (Vance, 1967)
4. Bereiter-Engelmann approach (Adkins and others, 1967)

Information: Pupil Performance

1. Intellectually and verbally behind (Beller, 1967) (O'Brien & Lopate, 1968)
2. Inferior ability to discriminate spoken word sound (Stern, 1966)
3. Small vocabularies (Malone, 1967) (Cheyney, 1967)
4. Language used to satisfy immediate needs, rarely to seek information (Malone, 1967)
5. Communication by pleading looks, smiles and whimpering (Malone, 1967)
6. Environment lacks opportunity and stimulation for intellectual growth (O'Brien & Lopate, 1968) (Vance, 1967)
7. Low educational attainment of parents (Hennigan, 1967)
8. Poor economic position (Hennigan, 1967)

Information: Tests Used

1. The Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (Karnes and others, 1966) (Vance, 1967)
2. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (Form A) (Karnes and others, 1966)
3. The Vance Language Skills (Vance, 1967)
4. The Cain-Levine Social Competency Scale (Vance, 1967)
5. Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale (Karnes and others, 1966)
6. Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception (Karnes and others, 1966)
7. Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Karnes and others, 1966)

Recommendations.

1. Expand child's sentences (Lavatelli, 1968)
2. Early language intervention (Beller, 1967)
3. Activities designed to elicit descriptive and comparative responses (Lavatelli, 1968)
4. Enlargement of linguistic repertoire (Cazden, 1966)
5. Acquisition of standard dialect (Cazden, 1966) (Bereiter, 1965)
6. Acquisition of grammar, structure of language (Cazden, 1966)
7. Acquisition of vocabulary (Cazden, 1966)
8. Acquisition of multiple functions of language (Cazden, 1966)
9. Warm, supportive, and stimulating teacher (Lavatelli, 1968) (O'Bien and Lopate, 1968)
10. Programmed materials (Bender, 1968) (Stern, 1966) (Gotkin, 1967) (Regan, 1967)

11. Task-oriented program approach (O'Brien & Lopate, 1968)
12. Repetition of grammatical sentences preferable to story telling (Stern, 1966)

SECTION IV

SUMMATION

The recommendations made in this section are based on two assumptions. The first and overriding one is that when action can be taken to alleviate underprivilege it should be taken. The second is that teachers should be trained professionally, as professionals, to be professional. In other words they should be trained so that they can competently diagnose the nature of any problem confronting them and bring to bear on it the knowledge and ability that will produce a successful solution. There are also two, second-order assumptions that ought to be stated as well. First, given the utility of Standard American English as a means of educational, social and economic advancement, all children should achieve proficiency in its use. Second, such proficiency should not be accomplished at the expense of the child's personal integrity or his social or ethnic identity.

Given these assumptions, the question to be addressed now is: what training should a teacher have in order to be able to deal with the language and communication education of underprivileged children.

In gross behavioristic terms, a teacher should be trained so that she can circumvent language communication problems likely to inhibit the children's learning. More specifically she should know how to make her pupils facile in the use of Standard American English so that communication itself is not an impediment to the mastery of language and other language-based knowledge. Such an answer is sufficiently broad to be virtually meaningless. A more directly practical answer to the question however, can only follow after the parameters of the training problem have been stated more fully. The full problem involves the trainee; as a language user, as the receptical of certain educational and social preconceptions, as a social analyst, as a language analyst, as a teacher of language, and as a teacher in the broadest sense of the word.

The Trainee as a Language User

Present Performance. By the time she enters a College of Education, the teacher-trainee has developed considerable language proficiency.

Almost invariably this will be in the use of Standard American English with slight overlays of adolescent peer group dialect, (mod, pop, hip, scene, or whatever is currently fashionable). Her language system will be complex and intricate, and its rule-base will be almost completely internalized. In other words she will be unable to examine her own language usage descriptively and analytically in anything other than a quite superficial manner. She will be, in fact, a marvellously intuitive language practitioner but she will be no linguistic diagnostician. In almost every situation she will be able, with a remarkable degree of proficiency, to choose words, order them, and present them in appropriate discourse form. True, trainees will differ in their demonstrated competency but all of them, in comparison with many other members of society, will be remarkably articulate, lucid and literate. Additionally, depending on their prior schooling experience, trainees may also have been inducted into the 'formal grammar' ritual and been indoctrinated in the belief that there is a proper, appropriate and virtuous form of language to which all men in general and teachers in particular should aspire. This proper language, complete with its prescribed grammar, phonology (pronunciation) and semantics is immutable and inviolate. The trainees, if they were thus 'educated', are likely to possess residual recollections of some of the ritual. They may, for example, be able to reproduce on cue, one or two grammatical, phonological and semantic rules that many years ago were dutifully and obediently over-learned.

The task confronting the trainers thus is a two-fold one that involves, for the trainee, (a) a new approach to language analysis, and (b) a re-examination of old attitudes, beliefs and values.

Language Awareness. To what extent and in what way should a prospective teacher become conscious of the intricacies of language behavior? Current consensus would answer; to no great extent and in no elaborate detail. In other words, there seems no immediate need to be aware of the nature and complexity of the linguistic domain. To this extent they need to develop familiarity with basic linguistic areas--grammar, syntax, phonology, semantics. They should be aware of basic linguistic concepts within each of these areas and most importantly, the processes linguists use when studying language behavior and developing language codes. To this end they should develop a trained 'ear', listening for variations of pronunciation, for new structures, new lexical items, thereby coming to see the novel as potentially interesting and exciting, not necessarily as aberration apt for censure. This implies that the teacher-to-be needs to develop a suitable basic model of communication so that in a given communication situation she can locate and isolate potential and actual sources of miscommunication.

Implicit in the discussion so far is the idea that prospective teachers need training in elementary linguistic analysis. Elaborating, the details of such a course requires careful collaboration between linguists and educationists with continuous recognition of the purpose the course is supposed to be serving. The educators would specify the requirements, the linguists the procedures necessary to meet them. A basic statement of requirements would include the following behavioral objectives:

1. Ability to construct rudimentary language records for simple language communities--for example, three-year old children from a given socio-ethnic situation.
2. Ability to recognize and reproduce a comprehensive phonology.
3. Ability to construct a limited lexicon of 'novel' forms--for example, child slang, hip, etc.

Necessarily these capabilities would be attendant on prior introduction to linguistic analysis and procedures.

The assumption lying behind these recommendations are principally that if teachers become familiar with, and minimally capable in the procedures of linguistic analysis, they will: (1) be able to recognize the implications of different natural language forms used by the children they teach, (2) be willing to probe and express language differences as interesting phenomena in their own right, (3) be in possession of a basis on which more advanced language training can be built.

The Language of Teaching. There is a further area of language usage that would not normally come under the purview of linguists--the language of teaching. Surprisingly, education is grossly ignorant of the characteristic of the language tool as it is employed in the teaching context. For instance, knowledge of the effects of different kinds of questions, of address-forms, of unelaborated concepts is remarkably slight. Yet concepts are the building blocks of education, questions are the mechanism that promote feedback, and the forms by which we address people provide the means for conveying status respect and affection--or denying it. This suggests that the language of educating--pedagese, if you like--ought also to be subject to overt examination. Here however, our recommendations must reflect the generally impoverished condition of our knowledge. Here the trainees' induction will have to be substantially a matter of coming to appreciate the nature of the problem. To this end, advantage would accrue if trainees were introduced to Smith's (1962) categories of teacher discourse, viz:

Defining
Describing
Designating
Stating
Reporting
Substituting
Evaluating
Opining
Classifying
Comparing & Contrasting
Conditional Inferring
Explaining: mechanical
    causal
    sequent
    procedural
    teleological
    normative

They should become competent at recognizing the forms as they are manifested in their own and others' behavior. With familiarity will come a certain precision in the use of the appropriate form for the appropriate purpose.

The assumption on which this recommendation rests is that language as a teaching tool can be sharpened and made more precise. In this way confusion can be avoided and much mis-communication wastage eliminated.

The Trainee as an Attitude Receptical.

Trainee teachers bring a number of attitudes with them to the teaching profession. It is not our task to judge these attitudes, merely to consider the extent to which they are likely to be helpful or harmful to the teaching situation. It seems reasonable to assume that the teacher-to-be who has thought about her vocation accepts the idea that she has something to give to children. She sees within herself something worthy of transmission to others. Given the traditional character of education, that transmission process is seen rather as something done to others than with them. She thus sees herself as an authority--at least a potential authority--manipulating and directing the lives of others in accordance with her genuine concern for and understanding of what is best for them. Her intentions are pure, her principles divine, and her mein just a little godlike. However, gods on occasions have feet of clay and it is our trainees' potentially puggy extremities that provoke concern. If incipient self-confidence and conviction crystallize as dogmatic authoritarianism--as they so easily can--then trouble looms. We have a long tradition of dogmatic authoritarianism in language teaching and it is very likely that our trainees have unwittingly absorbed some of it. Exposed to conventional ideas of 'proper', formal English, attuned to one brand of communication, and unfamiliar with the arbitrary nature of the so-called canons of 'good' English, they are likely to have unknowingly ingested a number of language attitudes. If this is the case, these internalized beliefs in the rightness of one form of language and the 'wrongness' of other forms can lead to damaging results in the teaching situation. The main task of attitude training then is to modify the arbitrary, dogmatic, egocentric and ethnocentric character of language attitudes that have been previously internalized. This task is more easily stated than achieved. For the trainee teacher faced with such reform, the prospect is threatening. It says to her, you are not quite the 'virtuous' model you thought yourself to be. It also implies that she is ignorant in an area she imagined to be mastered and, perhaps more disastrously, denies her an authoritative advantage she thought she had over her children.

There are two implications for the training program that follow. First, the trainees must come to appreciate the wisdom and utility of modifying their earlier (internalized) views. Second, their undermined confidence must be restored. Two training orientations are thus implied--personal education in linguistic relativism and appropriate training in language teaching.

Linguistic relativism. Presumably the trainees' introduction to linguistic analysis procedures will open the door to an appreciation of the ways in which the rule-governed character of language usage is established. To this extent she will be ready for an introduction to the comparative study of language usage. In so far as such study can demonstrate that different cultures use language to perform different functions--functions often lacking in English--the trainees' older dogmatic attitudes will have already been put under stress. However, attitude change is meaningless if the change is not manifested in behavior. To this end the trainees need to be able to perform in specific ways. Basic among these is the ability to discern meaning in messages and to test the veridicality of their interpretation. To this end they need to demonstrate facility in the decoding of messages and supplying alternatives --paraphrases. In the process they must obviously take into account more than the semantic content of the words used. They must become sensitive to the social meanings of intonation, inflexion and the form in which the message is structured. Additionally, they should be able to recognize non-verbal characteristics of communication in different cultural groups. Implicit in the discussion so far has been the idea that language is situationally specific--that in any given context some language procedures are more functionally appropriate than others. The idea of functional relativism permeates any comparative study of language usage.

Once trainees become sensitive to the situational relevance of language, they are part way toward understanding one aspect of social success. What is really implied by the term situational relevance is that some forms of behavior are considered appropriate in a given context and others are not. Clearly the person who violates the behavior convention will be less acceptable in the context and less able to enlist the support of others. To this extent the trainees should also be on the way to increasing their own proficiency in social adaptability. Eventually this should lead them to be willing to expose to their pupils as well, the nature of this human, social manoeuvering game.

The general line of argument taken suggests that an introductory course in anthropological linguistics tailored to meet the needs of beginning-teachers should be worked out. Once again this should result from careful collaboration between educators and linguists so that the desired behavioral outcomes can be achieved. Basic among these would be:

1) Facility in observing and reporting on communicative exchanges in varying social and ethnic contexts (including child groups).
2) Role playing using roles appropriate to selected social and ethnic contexts.

The assumptions underlying these recommendations are that knowledge of this social phenomenon will lead to both understanding, and competency in employing a skill. Additionally it is assumed that these skills and understandings will provide a basis for establishing a new kind of attitude that will support and sustain the trainees in their approach to language teaching.

Language Teaching. If prospective teachers are to survive the destruction of their earlier language attitudes, they must feel secure in their roles as language teachers. If they can no longer be moralists and usage arbiters--what can they be? The answer that the linguists give is that they can be resource people--the means by which the pupils come to appreciate the nature of the language 'game'. Thus their task in broad general terms involves more than the mere development of some language skills, it becomes as well, one of promoting interest in languages as a social tool. However, this time the teachers do not start with the belief that there is only one tool and only one way to use it. Nor do they start with the assumption that their pupils are language ignorant. Rather they begin by recognizing that their children, even at six years of age, have a fantastic understanding of, and ability in language use. In fact, as well-trained teachers, they will appreciate that even a six year old child has internalized a language-rule system more complex than linguists themselves have been able to formulate. The teachers then have the advantage of knowing that language has been, and is being acquired already--and substantially without the teachers' help. The issue that the teacher has to confront then is, when and in what way should she intervene in the language acquisition process. For the purposes of the present discussion of teacher attitudes, it is sufficient to stress that her attitudes should reflect: (i) acceptance of the child's own language form (dialect); (ii) willingness not to intervene in any prescriptive way until children are themselves aware of the functional relativism of language; and (iii) concern for probing and surfacing alternative forms as legitimate alternatives.

In other words, teachers have to internalize the idea that it is all right not to correct language (grammar, syntax, phonology and semantics) until the criterion of situationally relevant function is understood by the children. Also she should see herself as an expert who knows how to approach language analytically and objectively, not as an unthinking custodian of an erroneous and arbitrary set of 'standards' (sic.).

The Trainee as a Social Analyst

If the function of language differs from context to context it is because the contexts themselves are socially differentiated. Each context requires different social rituals--only one of which is language. It would be unreasonable to expect that trainees, knowledgeable about the functional relativity of language would also be sensitive to the full range and variety of social difference. Linguistics, structural, anthropological or otherwise, cannot be expected to carry the full burden of socially sensitising the trainees. It is apparent none-the-less, that sensitivity to the subtleties and nuances that feature in different social settings is a pre-requisite for the efficient teaching of underprivileged children. Teachers not only have to be acutely and astutely aware of the social significance of the messages they both get and give but they must also be empathetically sensitive to what it means to be what their students are. The teacher of Black children has got to feel what it is to be a Black American. The teacher of Puerto Ricans has to feel what it is to be a Puerto Rican. The teacher of ghetto youngsters has to know in the most internalized sense, what living in the ghetto is like. If she does so, she will appreciate not only the disadvantages but the advantages--not only the gloom but the gratification too. In this way she can approach existential problems in a realistic and balanced way--neither being a perpetual Jeremiah nor Polly-Anna. She will thus be able to capitalize on the strengths of Black, Puerto Rican, Indian or Mexican identity. As she gets on with her educating business, her knowledge of ethnic-social settings will provide her with a base for promoting socially and economically functional behavior.

All this demands a degree of insight into the nature of the social situations from which the children come and into their own perspectives on home, on parents, on the school, on their classroom, on education, on vocation, and on society in general. For its full development such an awareness needs more than familiarity with facts of linguistic life. Consequently trainees will also have to become aware of sociological and psychological insights relevant to their educating problems. Two future publications in the present series will be devoted to these special areas. At the moment it is merely necessary to note that whatever linguistic training is given, should be embedded in a program that encompasses other sociological and psychological aspects as well.

The Trainee as a Language Analyst

It has already been stated that the trainee ought to be able to subject her own language and others' language to systematic and objective scrutiny. She ought to be able to identify prospective causes of miscommunication and then have the means to modify her own (or others') behavior accordingly. In this way she would be able to sharpen her own use of the language tool and her ability to manipulate situations in accordance with her own objectives. The question to be considered now is the extent to which this 'game' should be made public and the pupils taught to play it. While opinions may differ on the appropriateness of treating this covert aspect of human behavior clinically, the author of this paper is predisposed towards a realistic point of view. If this is the way the social game is played--if this is a slice of reality--then we should not pretend it does not exist. Furthermore, if disadvantage is to be redressed, it seems appropriate to provide some of the means for beating one of the systems that serves to perpetuate underprivilege. However, the decision to surface the language game does not ensure that it can be done. In fact in this area both linguistics and education are particularly bedevilled by a lack of definitive, research-based knowledge about how the game is played. This implies that any attempt at teaching it is likely to proceed best as an enquiry rather than an exposition. It is also apparent that the timing of such an approach is dependent on the degree of sophistication the pupils can show in their appreciation of the functional relativity of language. To this extent the teacher's decision when to teach the language game, is a professional decision in the true sense of the word. It is worth noting in passing however, that it may be possible to draw attention to the social effects of communication very early in the child's educational life.

Readers will have noted that this discussion has been directed at the social effects of language usage when it might have been anticipated from the section heading, that linguistics analysis was to be examined. It seems apparent however, that the use of linguistic analysis can serve two purposes; either to preserve the practice of linguistic analysis for its intrinsic worth or to aid in the understanding of communication behavior. Linguists understandably have a vested interest in the analysis of language and pursue and promote it for its own (rewarding) sake. Unrestricted enthusiasm for such procedures however, can lead to the kind of ossification of rituals that were demonstrated in medieval scholasticism, in mid-20th century deference to a standardised English and in the preservation of the "Sabre-Tooth Curriculum" in Peddiwell's delightfully irreverent little book. Consequently, the second alternative is the only acceptable one. In-so-far as formal linguistic analysis can help in the understanding of language usage it should be called upon. Here again our legacy is uncertainty. We do not know the precise point at which linguistic analysis will be useful in the teaching program. Consequently, teachers have to be prepared so that they become the source of decision. They need to be given a sufficient (but not excessive) repertoire of linguistic analytic skills to be called into use when the time is right.

The Trainee as a Teacher of Language

Readers may have become restive at the somewhat loose use of the word 'language' throughout this discussion and, indeed, the book. The choice was deliberate. Whether we are dealing with oral language or written language or visual language (reading) the issues are basically the same. This assertion needs elaboration.

Oral Language. Children come to school with an oral language which may or may not be Standard American English. This language provides them with a basis for labelling, structuring, ordering and understanding their environments. If teachers wish to communicate with children they are faced with the necessity of either operating through the child's own language system or re-training the child to use a new one. The overwhelming weight of informed opinion has it that the most effective means of furthering the educational program is by operating initially through the child's own language system (vernacular). Furthermore, this language system is eminently satisfactory for the social situations that children meet in their day to day living. It is only when a new context is involved that the old system comes under strain. It can be argued of course, that as soon as the child gets to school a new context is immediately involved. In other words, there are language rituals and observances associated with the school, and children must conform to them if they want to survive in the school situation. As a statement of existential fact this is unquestionably true. If children do not conform to school language they will be rejected by the system--at present. However, to state a fact is not to justify it and we should, as part of the continual process of educational evaluation, be prepared to examine the nature of all such demands.

If it is the school's task to prepare pupils for profitable and satisfying lives in a society then the question arises, to what extent is the school's language appropriate for such a purpose. A good case could be made out in its favor if in fact, school language were reality oriented. That is, it reflected society's language. But, as we have seen earlier, society's language is many faceted. There are many variations on language and dialect themes that derive from the social and ethnic variety that prevails in these United States. To this extent school language does not reflect reality. However, it might be argued that the school language approximates the dominant language culture--middle-class Standard American English. This is substantially true, especially where informal conversational English is involved. It is however, substantially untrue when formal oral and written and visual English is treated. Performance demands here often reflect an artificiality that is manifestly peculiar to the school. The articulation and pronunciation performances required of children in school often bear little relationship to real life speech; structures advocated are often archaic, and lexical items that have disappeared from everyday usage are still demanded. As well, passages employed in reading-books are divorced from reality having parallels neither in the child's past or present social experiences or, thank goodness, his likely future ones.

Written Language. Written language is frequently subjected to similar artificial demands--especially when written language is being first presented. At a time when the child's principal task is to associate a familiar oral performance with a totally unfamiliar form of written symbolism, teachers complicate the matter immeasurably by an unneccessary and unthinking intrusion of spelling and punctuation issues. They thus ensure repeated failure for the child and his eldgibility for repeated censure.

There are then three basic objections to language teaching practices that are often followed in the average city school, they are:

1) that teaching programs are often unrealistic because they ignore the functional relativity of language,
2) that programs are often educationally unsound as they fail to capitalize on the language skills Non-Standard speakers have,
3) that programs are often self-deluding in that they create artificial language rituals and artificial language contexts.

Alternatives. Given this unsatisfactory state of affairs what alternative procedures appear more feasible at the moment? The following recommendations seem consistent with current insights and what limited research that has been undertaken:

1) Teachers should capitalize on the language the child already has. To this extent, they should accept it, permit its use and base transitions to both written and visual language on it. These two latter points mean that:
2) Formal oral language training in Standard American English should be deferred until functional relativity is understood and accepted.
3) That the child's initial writing experiences should not be constrained by demands for phrasings and constructions not found in the child's every-day speech. By the same token, spelling and punctuation should only receive incidental attention.

However, because the association between the sound of a word and its representations as a written symbol is quite arbitrary, there is no need to invent 'phoney' symbolic forms in an attempt to approximate the child's Non-Standard presentation.

4) That for reading materials Standard American English should be used but if a child while reading translates into Non-Standard forms, this should be accepted. In other words if the 'meaning' is apprehended by the reader, then specific word reproduction should not be demanded.

These recommendations obviously place greatest value on the gross communicative character of language. In doing so they assert that some of the concerns of earlier years can be left in obeyance if not abandoned.. The reasons for taking the position are relatively straight-forward. Most communication is basically a matter of conveying gross impression. In conversation we seldom use words precisely. In fact when precision of communication is necessary (as it is from time to time) we revert to forms of language virtually unintelligible to the uninitiated, e.g. legal language, scientific language and (increasingly) mathematical and computational language.

The suggestion that teachers can pay less attention to some language rituals then they did before does not mean that Standards are being lowered--merely that the earlier ritual is irrelevant. If for example, everyone knows that 'he be coming' means, to all intents and purposes, the same as 'he is coming', a reproduction lapse by a pupil who reads the former when the latter was the printed form, is of no great consequence. This only represents 'sloppy' reproduction when reproduction is important. Whether accurate reproduction is important is, of course, merely another case of functional relativism. It is socially important under given conditions--in a newscast, an elocution competition, when submitting an article for a journal or in most situations where Standard American English is the expected form and where violation is (socially) disfunctional. However, as we saw earlier, the school has no right to declare itself an exclusive Standard American English context that has taken upon itself the role of social judge and jury.

A further point should be made before leaving this important issue.

When educational research is given the encouragement (and the support) to undertake job analyses of teaching, it will be found that a considerable amount of teaching time goes into repetitive correcting of minor language violations. Spelling, punctuation, pronunciation, structure, all come in for persistent and perpetual attention. Inevitably the rituals go: "That's wrong, this is right"and, by implication, "That's bad, this is good", and by extrapolation, "You are bad, ignorant, uncouth". Not only is valuable teaching time wasted with such ad hoc, unsystematic interruptions of continuity but as negative reinforcement they also create negative and antagonistic feelings and, ultimately, negative behavior in the pupils. Avoiding such situations pays a double divident--educationally and attitudinally.

Readers who because of their own socialisation find these arguments exceptionable may be inclined to object that the 'bad' habits thus unchecked will constitute a perpetual handicap for the child. Under current circumstances this is undeniably true. Children who are unsophisticated about the functional relativity of language and who do not possess the means for adapting their own language performances to different situations, frequently find themselves unacceptable--particularly so in educational situations. However, the 'bad habits' question really turns on one's point of view about language learning and performance.

At the heart of the argument lies the notion that certain aspects of language performance need to become automatic. Automation is achieved of course, by constant repetition, suitably reinforced--positive reinforcement for correct performance, negative for incorrect. To this extent then, language is seen as reflexive, therefore dependant on conditioning. Now, it is true that all individuals work within a limited language repertoire. They have a limited vocabulary, a limited phonology, and limited lexicon, and a limited number of structures. However, within this repertoire, the number and variety of changes and combinations that may be employed is virtually infinite. In the production of a given language performance then, the individual must reach into his repertoire and select reflectively rather than reflexively--the particular components appropriate at the moment. Now obviously, if the repertoire does not contain a form appropriate for a given situation, then the appropriate performance cannot be produced. But if the form is there, then all that is needed is the development of the choice mechanism so that the performer will make the appropriate selection. In other words, if a child is familiar only with "I seen" then, irrespective of context, when past tense is called for he will say "I seen". If however, he has two alternatives "I seen" and "I saw" then either may be called upon. If he is also aware of functional relativity, then he will probably use "I seen" with his peers and parents and "I saw" with his teacher or employer. The choice procedures involved are presumably no different from those necessary when deciding to use "very" or "extremely"; "sure thing" or indubitably"; "would you please leave the room" or "get the hell out of here"!

Given the fact that our proposals provide for the child who uses "I seen" habitually to be given "I saw " as an alternative and an awareness of functional relativity, there are only two points at issue. They are, will a delayed introduction of the alternate form increase learning difficulties and will over-exposure to one form inhibit the learning of the other? Here again the definitive knowledge available to us is limited. One would imagine that there should be an optimum time for introducing different kinds of language forms and an optimum time for introducing their alternatives. Informed opinion would suggest that a linguistic hardening of the arteries does occur with increasing age. It would also suggest that twin lines of attack (Standard English with Non-Standard speakers) is feasible from a quite early age provided, (i) no denigration of the vernacular occurs, (ii) exposure to the second dialect (Standard) is gradual, and (iii) the teaching is not formalistic. In this respect information and understanding gained from the study of English taught as a second language, is relevant. In concrete terms this means that initial teaching should be done in the vernacular (Non-Standard) with gradual familiarisation with the conventions of Standard English occurring so that by Grade III all teaching can be in Standard English.

Written Language. Where does written language then fit into the scheme of things? There are two issues at stake. The first is concerned with enabling the child to transpose words that he hears and speaks into a different symbolic form. This is only a coding-decoding or translation problem. As such it is, or should be, quite distinct from the second issue--conformity to writing conventions. In the same way that social conventions have developed, writing conventions have emerged also. Identically with social conventions, they are situation specific too. Thus there are writing conventions that novelists use, that poets use, that playwrights use, that lawyers use, that minute keepers use, that telegram and letter writers use, and so on. The problem for the pupil trying to achieve mastery over written language then is a multifaceted one. The question is not only how can he approach it, but also how far can he legitimately expect to get. The human being who can turn his hand to all the various forms of written English and achieve success consistently, has yet to be born. Insoluble though the last issue may be, one thing is clear when the two issues are taken into account together--it is dysfunctional to confuse the second with the first. Translation of oral symbols into written symbols is a coding game that should initially proceed without any regard for the writing style game. Oral language conventions are manifestly different from writing (style) conventions. Transcripts of verbal exchanges--even from highly literate and articulate speakers--reflect a remarkable degree of incoherence and literary inelegance. Thus it is to be expected that children will learn to use a written code faster if they are allowed to do so without the intrusion of stylistic norms. However, once the functional relativity of writing is also appreciated, the learning of appropriate conventions for appropriate situations can proceed apace.

Motivation

It is undoubtedly true to say that the proportion of children who are disenchanted with education is appreciably higher in disadvantaged slum schools than elsewhere. It is also true that such children come from home and community environments where they receive little encouragement to like or value education. However, it is also true that schools do very little to combat effectively the resultant apathy, negativism and hostility. They may even add to it. Underprivileged children beginning school have the same potential for energetic activity that others have. The school's failure to realize that potential ought to be subject to careful scrutiny. However, once again, definitive evidence has not been sought so we are unable to locate the precise causes of the motivational degeneration of urban underprivileged school children.

Nonetheless it is an uncontestable fact that motivation is a necessary ingredient for success. Although merely wanting something strongly is no guarantee that it will be achieved, not to want it ensures that it will not be. A critical problem for teachers concerned with the language of underprivileged children is motivation--how to combat existing negative attitudes and promote new positive ones.

Motivation as an educational phenomenon is basic to teaching and it is too complex to be dealt with adequately here.* Nonetheless there are several points that should be made. The first is that the old (corrective) approach to language learning is seen as basically dysfunctional. It inhibits learning and creates negative attitudes. Secondly, teachers professionally trained to appreciate the facts of language life, will be able to avoid the errors of their older colleagues because of their greater linguistic security and awareness. Thirdly, such competency breeds confidence and because confidence encourages enthusiasm and because enthusiasm tends to be infectious some positive attitudes will result, as it were, by accident.

If we are to rely on the teacher's own competency and understanding as the principal source of pupil motivation, there are precautions that have to be taken. First teachers have to become aware of ways of releasing the untapped sources of pupil enthusiasm and second, they must have the means for releasing them.

Pupil Perspective. People who want to get something badly enough will try to get it. What then are underprivileged children most likely to want? The traditional educational answer would be--affection and knowledge. They want affection because all children do, and they want knowledge because knowledge is the key to future success. However, the future-looking orientation of education has seemed strangely unrealistic to underprivileged children. The teacher may preach the virtues of education or, more properly, the advantages of conforming to the education rituals, but the children know better. They know the harsh reality of underprivileged life. They know the discouragement and hopelessness attendant on growing up in the ghetto. They know the discrepancy between societal idealism and societal actuality. They are cynical--and understandably so. They accept neither the school, its pious unrealism or the teacher who represents the system. For the same reasons, the teacher's affection may be equally unacceptable, though even more unacceptable however, is her censure and negative evaluation.

---

* It will receive more detailed treatment in the psychology monograph in the same series.

A more realistic answer to the question, what are underprivileged children likely to want, then must itself seem a little cynical. Undoubtedly, they would like entertainment, titillation and amusement--so would we all much of the time. Also they would like a measure of power--the means to establish some basis of self-vindication, self-valuing--again, so would we all. But, as Lord Acton wrote, "power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely". How then can the legitimate desire for power be used to good advantage. A necessary condition for the responsible use of power is that it should go hand in hand with an authoritativeness, that gives it justification. Power to be effective has to be justifiable and the justification itself has to be uncontestable. Presumably then, teachers should be able to provide pupils with the means for gaining authoritativeness, so they can use power. But where may they use their power? Within the limits of the immediacy criterion accepted earlier, there are several possible alternatives. One is the classroom itself, one is the school, others are to be found in the environments of home and society at large. To what extent then should pupils be encouraged to exercise power in the educational environment itself. The answer is simple, given the educative function of the school. In-so-far as they have educational authoritativeness--in-so-far as they can promote the educative function, children are entitled to power. A teacher's power stems from her authoritativeness as an educator. If she cannot educate then she has no right to power. But neither, it should be noted, has anyone else who cannot educate.

The implications of this excursion away from the direct consideration of language teaching are twofold. First, in-so-far as pupils can exercise an amount of educationally legitimate power in classrooms they should be encouraged to do so. For example, the knowledge that a Non-Standard speaker has about his language will very likely substantially exceed the teachers'. The astute teacher will defer to such authority and use it. Second, the situations most salient to pupils, will be out-of-school situations--the various play, home and work settings of the community. Consequently it behoves the teacher to to be knowledgeable about these so that the language facility she offers her pupils can be seen as directly relevant.

For the purpose of developing a training program then, the prospective teachers should have intimate contact with the kind of setting likely to be found in a cross-section of urban communities. Here again the sociological, anthropological, linguistic programs will be relevant. However, these programs need to be buttressed by experiential contact. The full range and variety of such contact would be contingent on the amount of time and the opportunity available. Among the kinds of activities course planners would undoubtedly want to consider would be, for example: observational visits to ghettos; student-teaching postings to inner city schools; assignments to accompany social workers, youth workers, church workers etc.; home visits; vacation work in ghettos etc. As well, supplementary material in the form of real records of urban life, e.g. tape recorded interviews with, say, landlords, rent collectors, shop keepers, municipal authorities, local leaders, school drop-outs, parents, the police etc., etc., could all add to the realism. Additional aids, like videotaped, simulated situations requiring decisions, case studies of communities, and so on, might also be used. Necessarily the acquisition of program components like these would require close collaboration between program planners and society's representatives.

The assumption behind these suggestions is that if teachers know about 'the urban condition' or more specifically, about the kinds of lives their children lead, then they will be better equipped to meet the children on their (the children's) own ground. If they can do so then their probability of capitalizing on existing interest is high. It follows that once the initial connection is made, the enlargement of horizons and the extrapolation to other situations becomes possible.

Conclusion

The existential facts of contemporary urban education are sobering. The overall impression gained is one of gloom. Apathy, depression and discouragement abound. The net result is that teachers are dissatisfied, pupils are disenchanted and both are frustrated. From the society's point of view, the squandering of human and economic capital is incredibly senseless. Yet, because schools and education systems have little power to ameliorate the problem, the record continues to be one of small success balanced against considerable failure. It is likely to be some time before the education systems (and society) can be geared to really meet the immensity of the social challenge. Meantime, society relies, as it always has, on the competency, goodwill and selflessness of the individual teacher.

The urban teachers' task is appreciably more difficult now than it was ten, twenty, or fifty years ago. Now the forces of underprivilege are vocal--and powerful. Now the insistency for reform is more urgent. Now the pressure from a militant urban society is mounting. What resources can the individual teacher bring to bear in this moment of crisis? Assuredly, the roles and rituals of earlier years are no longer appropriate. Clearly, the theoretical foundations that supported teachers in the past have crumbled and the teacher of today needs new resources. What these resources should be however, is less easily stated. It is tempting under such circumstances of social stress to resort to faith positions--to crusade and evangelise. But the demonstration of emotional intensity is no guarantee of educational success. Chasing enthusiasms--though emotionally satisfying--provides an impoverished means for solving social problems. More promise resides in a considered and thoughtful approach.

This book has been dedicated to the thoughtful solution of social problems. The reasons are simple. The United States has demonstrated to the world a technological proficiency of mammoth proportions. That proficiency was gained through the application of scientific methods and procedures. By definition, scientific methods require: (1) thoughtful examination of an initially undesired state of affairs (a problem), (2) the accumulation of information relevant to it, (3) the development of a theoretical statement that explains why a particular attack on it is likely to succeed, (4) the creation of the device, instrument or method to deal with the problem, (5) preliminary testing, (6) evaluation, and (7) provided the testing was satisfactory, development and dissemination. Education however, has been remarkably remiss in developing its own scientific approaches to education. Rather it tends to place faith now in this bright, new, spectacular (but unexamined and untested) idea, now in that one.

The present, unpretentious attack on one of the problems thought to be associated with the undesired state of affairs (problem) that is 'education of the underprivileged', has gone through stages one, two and three above. The fourth stage--the creation of the device, comes next. If it were based on the strategy outlined in this present chapter, it would start by accepting the central importance of language in education. It would also recognize that language education and the education language have been substantially ineffective under conditions of urban underprivilege. Basing its approach on the idea of the functional relativity of language use, it would then proceed to train and educate teachers in a new 'acceptant' approach to language in teaching. The means by which it does so would be worked out through careful cooperation between linguists, cultural anthropologists, and educationists who as experts have the means to devise a program. If their program is to be viable and vital it will relate to the real-world-out-there. To this extent the program planners will call on other experts--those who inhabit the real world of the urban ghetto. The co-operation thus established will, hopefully, ensure continued liaison between training organisations, trainers and the urban society. Once the program is developed and students are trained, testing evaluation and refinement will follow.

As the reader will no doubt have seen, the wheel has come the full circle. We started out with a statement of faith--educational underprivilege is socially unacceptable. We finish with another--the scientific solution of social problems is possible. We apologize for neither.